

THE NEW SOCIALISM

WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR

THE GIRLHOOD OF MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS

With Photogravure Portraits, 12s. net

"For such a task Miss Stoddart was uncommonly well qualified. To her womanly instincts, her level head, her facile and graceful pen, have been added an intimate personal knowledge of those parts of France in which the lot of the Scottish Queen was cast, an even more remarkable knowledge of the history of the period, and a patient perseverance which is so essential in historical research."—
D. HAY FLEMING, LL.D., in *The Bookman*.

THE LIFE OF THE EMPRESS EUGÉNIE

Third Edition. Illustrated, 10s. 6d. net.

"Miss Stoddart's 'Life of the Empress Eugénie' is an exception to the rule that biographies of living people are undesirable. The Empress has now become as much a historical figure of the past as if she had been dead for many years. . . . Miss Stoddart has told her romantic story well; it will hold the reader with unflagging interest. No one, I think, could have told it better than Miss Stoddart has done."—*Sphere*.

LONDON: HODDER AND STOUGHTON

THE
NEW SOCIALISM

AN IMPARTIAL INQUIRY

BY
JANE T. STODDART

HODDER AND STOUGHTON
LONDON MCMIX

First Edition, October 1909

Second Edition, November 1909

PREFACE

THE present book occupies, so far as I am aware, new ground among English books on Socialism. The larger historical books on the subject stop short of recent years, and leave unchronicled much Socialist thought and action of the utmost importance. My aim has been to give as briefly and fairly as possible an account of the Socialist movement over the world during the last ten years. Like everything else, Socialism has undergone a process of change, and must be studied in the works of its latest authorities. Extreme utterances of individuals have been largely disregarded. In such a movement as Socialism much exaggeration was inevitable. But Socialism has its great thinkers and students, men as candid, as thoughtful, and as earnest as any to be found in other camps. These thinkers are constructive as well as destructive. They are not afraid to acknowledge the immense difficulties that have to be conquered ere the goal is reached, and they have taken them up in earnest, admitting in many cases that they are not yet completely solved. That Socialism is a movement full of mighty import to mankind, and that the questions which it raises may at any moment present themselves in their most practical form, is now obvious to all. It is only by understanding what Socialists ask for, and why they ask it, by studying their views and arguments in their best, most considered and most impressive form that any fruitful discussion can be carried on.

It is in this spirit that I have endeavoured to set forth the main points in the recent literature of Socialism. The chief books published on the Continent as well as the English literature of the subject have been thoroughly examined, and every effort has been made to secure a just and accurate account of the main issues. The periodical literature of Socialism has also been investigated to the best of my ability. It is so extensive that an absolutely complete knowledge is unattainable, but I hope that few important omissions will be found.

In the Supplement I have given chapters on Revolutionary Syndicalism ; Recent Developments of American Socialism ; and Notes on Australian Socialism. There are good reasons for separat-

ing these from the main part of the book. The serious Socialist are more and more striving after precision of language, and much that is called Socialistic is not genuine Socialism.

The years 1897-98, the Jubilee period of the Communist Manifesto, form the natural point of departure for a study of the New Socialism. In 1898 Marx had been dead fifteen years, and Liebknecht, in his old age, was living with his memories. The veteran campaigner rejoiced in the overthrow of Bismarck and in the electoral results which made his party numerically the strongest in Germany. He did not survive to see the full effects of the criticism which was brought to bear on the Marxian system, nor could he have anticipated the results of the new Marxian revival under Sorel, which we know as Revolutionary Syndicalism. Students all over Europe have recognized that the years 1897-98 mark a parting of the ways. From that point onwards we can distinguish the three great modern groups—Revisionists, Orthodox Marxian and Revolutionaries. It is hardly needful to insist on the enormous progress of the Socialist movement all over the world during these years. The American Socialist, Robert Hunter, in his new book *Socialists at Work*, puts the world Socialist vote at 7,434,616. This represents the vote obtained by the various national parties at the latest elections up to 1907. In Great Britain, at the general election of 1906, according to the *Reformers' Year-book*, 274,631 votes were cast for the Socialists, 98,902 for the "Labour Party," and 156,930 for the Trade Unionists. In Germany, in 1907, though the Socialists were apparently defeated, they polled three and a quarter million votes, a quarter of a million more than in 1903, and over a million more than in 1898. Bebel said that the elections had shown that every third man over twenty-five in Germany was a Social Democrat. In Austria the Socialists had an overwhelming success at the general election in May 1907, the first under universal suffrage. They polled 1,041,948 votes, a third of the total vote cast. In Belgium, in 1904, the Socialist vote was 469,094. In France, in 1906, it was about 900,000, as compared with half a million (roughly) in 1893. In Italy, in 1904, the Socialists polled 320,000, but these figures convey no adequate idea of the strength of the party. The suffrage in Italy is restricted by a literary test and over 4,000,000 working men are excluded from the ballot.

While the utmost care has been taken to ensure accuracy, it is hardly possible to avoid error in a subject so large and complicated and I shall gratefully receive and acknowledge any corrections.

Quotations have been taken in all cases from original sources.

J. T. S.

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
	PREFACE	v
	THE SCOPE OF THE INQUIRY	i
	NOTES ON THE LITERATURE	4
I.	SOCIALISM IN TRANSITION: OBSOLETE THEORIES .	21
II.	THE GENERAL PROGRAMME OF SOCIALISM .	29
III.	SOCIALISTS AND EXPROPRIATION	38
IV.	THE QUESTION OF COMPENSATION	46
V.	THE QUESTION OF INHERITANCE	55
VI.	SOCIALISTS AND SMALL PROPERTY-OWNERS	64
VII.	PRACTICAL WORKING OF THE SOCIALIST STATE .	73
VIII.	THE COMMANDEERING OF LIVES UNDER SOCIALISM .	82
IX.	THE REWARDS OF LABOUR UNDER SOCIALISM .	92
X.	SOCIALISM AND THE FAMILY	101
XI.	SOCIALISM AND RELIGION	118
XII.	IS THERE A CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM?	135
XIII.	THE PRESS UNDER SOCIALISM	144
XIV.	PATRIOTISM, ARMAMENTS, AND FOREIGN POLICY .	154
XV.	THE DREAM OF INTERNATIONALISM	163
XVI.	AT THE GRAVE OF KARL MARX	171

SUPPLEMENTARY CHAPTERS

	PAGE
I. REVOLUTIONARY SYNDICALISM	
I. LEADERS AND PRINCIPLES	183
II. THE TEACHING OF GEORGES SOREL	190
III. TRADES-UNIONS AND THE GENERAL STRIKE	199
IV. THE GENERAL STRIKE: VIEWS OF SOCIALIST LEADERS	205
V. PROSPECTS OF THE PARTY OF VIOLENCE	217
II. RECENT DEVELOPMENTS OF AMERICAN SOCIALISM	
I. HISTORICAL NOTES	225
II. AN AMERICAN SOCIALIST LECTURER: MR. JOHN SPARGO	230
III. 'WHY IS THERE NO SOCIALISM IN THE UNITED STATES?'	233
III. NOTES ON AUSTRALIAN SOCIALISM	
I. SOCIALISM WITHOUT DOCTRINES	243
II. THE CAREER OF WILLIAM LANE	247
III. VIEWS OF A GERMAN WORKMAN AT MELBOURNE	250
IV. DIVISIONS OF AUSTRALIAN SOCIALISTS	254
V. THE NEWER LABOUR LEGISLATION	260
INDEX	265

THE SCOPE OF THE INQUIRY

THE writer's purpose in the following pages might be summed up in that saying of Dunoyer which is quoted by Werner Sombart as the motto of his best-known book :
" *Je ne propose rien; je n'impose rien; j'expose.*"

The title, *The New Socialism*, has been chosen because the international Socialist literature which is here dealt with belongs almost entirely to the last ten years.

The word "impartial" has been used as separating this work, at least in intention, from anti-Socialist writings like those of M. Yves Guyot, whose mental attitude is defined in the title of one of his books, *La Comédie Socialiste*. In the preface to a later volume M. Guyot writes—

"My purpose in the following pages has been to reduce to their true value the Socialistic sophisms with which some clever and often unscrupulous men amuse idle inquirers and draw the masses after them." . . . "What has become," asks M. Guyot, "of the Utopias of Fourier and Cabet, Louis Blanc's scheme for the organization of work, Proudhon's bank of exchange, the question of the right to work, Lassalle's iron law of wages, the predictions of the Communist Manifesto of Karl Marx and Engels?"¹

We search the writings of this distinguished French publicist in vain for words of true sympathy with the poor. Like an anti-Socialist François Villon, he claims that the winds have carried away all the older theories.

¹ *Sophismes socialistes et Faits économiques*. Félix Alcan. 1908.

He does not ask what seeds they left behind—seeds which are germinating at this hour.

The icy hardness of the earlier individualistic literature is represented in France by M. Guyot and in England by Mr. W. H. Mallock. Such writers are so much occupied in exposing the fallacies of the prophets of Socialism that they ignore the appeal of the unemployed and hungry. Mr. Mallock makes merry over the increasing number of persons "who claim for their own opinions the title of socialistic, but whose quarrel with the existing system is very far from apparent, while less apparent still is the manner in which they propose to alter it. The persons to whom I refer consist mainly of academic students, professors, clergymen, and also of emotional ladies, who enjoy the attention of footmen in faultless liveries and say their prayers out of prayer-books with jewelled clasps." ¹

The anti-Socialist delights in laying bare every extravagant suggestion of early nineteenth century thinkers. Mr. Mallock discusses humorously the phalansteries of Fourier, "which appear to have been imaginary anticipations of the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. Here, lapped in luxury, they were to feast at common tables; and between meals the men were to work in the fields singing, while a lady accompanied their voices on a grand piano under a hedge." ²

This kind of badinage must be singularly unpleasing to those who have studied the works of Mr. Charles Booth, Mr. Rowntree, or Mr. Chiozza Money; who realize how vast is the army of the poor, how trifling the minority of the well-to-do, and what multitudes, amidst

¹ *A Critical Examination of Socialism*, pp. 4, 5. Murray. 1908.

² *Ibid.* p. 7.

our modern civilization, are living on the verge of hunger. M. Guyot allies himself with the editor of the *Spectator*, but in his *Letters to a Working Man* and his leading articles, Mr. St. Loe Strachey repeatedly says that if he thought Socialism would cure the ills which make the world so dark he would be a Socialist to-morrow. We may quote this passage from the *Spectator* of February 1, 1908—

“I am no more content than are the Socialists with things as they are, and I most earnestly desire that they should be made better, and would gladly consent to any and every pecuniary sacrifice demanded by the Socialists if I thought that such sacrifices would provide a remedy.”

That sentence is axiomatic for every honest-minded student of Socialism to-day. If it could be proved that Socialism would raise the condition of the poor and provide for them a more generous share of the world's wealth, only the meanest spirits would shrink from accepting its name and principles. The vision of a world without poverty is the most alluring of dreams.

The dying words of Erasmus, “*Domine fac finem*,” “Lord, make an end,” must rise in the hearts of all who have understood the sufferings of the disinherited masses.

NOTES ON THE LITERATURE

THE literature of Socialism is so extensive that a lifetime might easily be devoted to its mastery. The bibliography of Stammhammer is the best guide to the older books and pamphlets. It ends with 1898, the year in which our own special study begins, and as the two volumes of Stammhammer (1893 and 1899) are on the shelves of the British Museum, we need not borrow anything from his pages. The British Museum Library, it may be said in passing, is very imperfectly provided with recent Socialist books and periodicals.

The student will find it advisable to become a subscriber to various foreign periodicals. The writer gratefully acknowledges constant help received from *Die Neue Zeit*, which is under the control of Karl Kautsky, the intellectual leader of modern Marxian Socialism.¹ Almost every issue of this weekly journal contains at least one article of permanent value. Kautsky is in touch with the newest Socialist movements in every part of the world. American, Australian, French and British Socialists are among his contributors. His own articles, with their breadth of knowledge, transparent honesty, and firm grasp of the international situation, have something also of the popular frankness of Luther's phraseology. The expressions which Georg Ellinger applies to Luther's style

¹ *Die Neue Zeit* is published by Paul Singer at Stuttgart.

“*unvergleichlich kernig*,” “*derb-volkstümlich*,” are applicable to that of Kautsky. While the views of this distinguished thinker may be best understood by a careful study of his magazine, his books are indispensable to the inquirer. We may mention especially *Das Erfurter Programm*¹ and *Karl Marx' Oekonomische Lehren*.² Kautsky's work on the agrarian question,³ has attracted much attention on the Continent. His famous reply to Bernstein was published ten years ago in Stuttgart.⁴ Among his smaller publications we may mention *Die Soziale Revolution*⁵ and *Die Sozialdemokratie und die katholische Kirche*.⁶

Many of Kautsky's writings have been translated into French, and we note that an eminent American Socialist, Mr. Robert Hunter, in his new book, *Socialists at Work*, recommends *Die Agrarfrage* under its French title. Kautsky deserves to be studied in his native tongue.

A very useful German magazine is *Sozialistische Monatshefte*,⁷ edited by Dr. J. Bloch. Among the contributors we find not only the chief German Socialists of the younger school, but many foreign writers. For example, the magazine for May 6, 1909, had an article by Mr. Ramsay Macdonald on *The Crisis in English Socialism*; and this was followed by a paper by Eduard Bernstein dealing with the Edinburgh Congress. In March of this year, Paul Göhre discussed the difficult question of the secessions of working people from the Lutheran Church, (*Kirche und Kirchenaustrittsbewegung*). Most of the

¹ Stuttgart. J. H. W. Dietz Nachf. 1907. 8th edition.

² Same publishers. 1906. 11th edition.

³ *Die Agrarfrage*. Same publishers. 1899.

⁴ *Bernstein und das Sozialdemokratische Programm*. Same publishers.

⁵ Berlin. Buchhandlung Vorwärts. 1907. 2nd edition.

⁶ Same publishers. 1906. 2nd edition.

⁷ Berlin, W., Potsdamer Strasse, 121 H. The numbers appear fortnightly.

articles in the *Monatshefte* are written in a bright, popular style, and the magazine keeps its readers fully in touch with the main currents of Socialist thought.

The writer has drawn constant help from the *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik*, which is now edited by Edgar Jaffé in association with Werner Sombart and Max Weber.¹ We can hardly exaggerate the importance of the work which German Sociologists are doing through the pages of this review.

Professor Werner Sombart of Berlin is one of the chief living authorities on international Socialism. He is best known to the wider public by his book entitled *Sozialismus und Soziale Bewegung*.² His learned work, *Der moderne Kapitalismus*, is necessary for the historical student in the field of modern economics. Prof. Aloys Schulte, in a note to his celebrated book, *The Fuggers in Rome*, praises Werner Sombart's study of the great Augsburg banking firm.³ The inspiring influence of Prof. Sombart is felt on every page of the *Archiv*.

In French periodical literature we may mention especially *La Revue Socialiste*, edited by Eugène Fournière, as representing the more moderate tendencies of the party. M. Fournière is one of the chief contributors to his own magazine. His volumes of essays are well worth reading.

In Italy the chief Reformist journal is *Critica Sociale*, which is published in Milan. This represents the views of Turati and his school, but it also gives a comprehensive survey of the general Socialist movement. We have found in recent numbers, well-informed contributions:

¹ This review is a new series of the *Archiv für Soziale Geistesgeschichte und Statistik* Tübingen. Mohr.

² Revised and enlarged edition. 1908. Gustav Fischer. Jena.

³ *Die Fugger in Rom*, vol. i. p. 2, Note.

on English Parliamentary measures and many excellent reviews.

THE HISTORY OF SOCIALISM

For the English historical beginner, Mr. Kirkup's *History of Socialism* (A. & C. Black, 3rd edition, 1906) is the best manual. It is the fruit of many years of patient study, and its worth may best be appreciated by comparing it with the lectures of Prof. Karl Diehl of Königsberg, which were published for the first time in 1906, and cover some of the same ground.¹

Dr. John Rae's work, *Contemporary Socialism* (Sonnenschein), is in its third edition, and carries us to 1900. Clearness of style and fulness of information are its characteristics. A popular history to be named with these is Mr. Goddard H. Orpen's translation of Émile de Laveleye's book, *The Socialism of To-day* (Leadenhall Press). A classical American work is Morris Hillquit's *History of Socialism in the United States* (Funk & Wagnalls).

The historian's task has been accomplished not only on the wider and more general scale, but in the minuter branches of specialism. Workers in the field of German Socialism, for example, will find constant help from Mr. W. H. Dawson's books, *Bismarck and State Socialism* and *German Socialism and Lassalle* (Sonnenschein). Students of Saint Simonism cannot afford to neglect Mr. A. J. Booth or M. Janet. The writings of Prof. Ely are the best for inquirers into the history of the earlier American Socialism who have not time to read the celebrated books of Noyes and Sartorius von Waltershausen.

¹ *Ueber Sozialismus, Kommunismus und Anarchismus*, Gustav Fischer. Jena. 1906,

For the history of German Socialism, Mehring is, of course, a standard authority, but for France there has been no adequate successor, in Werner Sombart's opinion, to Lorenz von Stein. We may recommend, however, Prof. Georges Weill's large volume, *Histoire du Mouvement social en France* (1852-1902). This was published in 1905 by Félix Alcan, Paris. Dr. Weill's careful bibliography gives a long list of works on French social questions published before 1904.

THE PRINCIPLES OF SOCIALISM

The most scholarly work in our language on the principles of Socialism is that of Prof. Flint (1894). The first eight chapters of the book were enlarged from papers originally published in *Good Words* for 1890-91. Prof. Flint mentions in his preface that the series originated in a course of lectures delivered a few winters previously before an audience chiefly of working men. His book provides, especially in the supplementary notes, waymarks to the literature before 1890. Prof. Flint's great work deserves to be better known on the Continent. It is a curious fact that Prof. Masaryk of Prague should suppose that Prof. Flint belongs to the group of English "Christian Socialists," fixing his place, in a bibliography, between the names of the Revs. M. Kaufmann and Stewart D. Headlam.

In the department of philosophic Socialist literature admirable work has been done by the Germans and Italians. To take one name from among many German authors, we find that Masaryk's book, *Die philosophischen und soziologischen Grundlagen des Marxismus* (Vienna 1899), is quoted with respectful attention by such a leader

as M. Vandervelde. The works of the late Prof. Antonio Labriola, of Filippo Turati, S. Merlino, Benedetto Croce, Achille Loria, Eugenio Rignano and Enrico Ferri show the remarkable productivity of Italian Socialist authors of the various schools during recent years. A book which deserves praise among the most recent Italian publication is that of Bonomi, *Le Vie Nuove del Socialismo* (Remo Sandron, 1907).

Attention should also be called to the work of an "Italianized German," Dr. Robert Michels, entitled *Il Proletariato e la Borghesia nel movimento socialista italiano* (Turin, Fratelli Bocca, 1908). A reviewer in *Le Mouvement Socialiste* for January 1909 remarks that "the book of Michels is without doubt the fullest, the most serious, the most patient study that has been published on the Italian Socialist movement in these later times, whether from the analytical or the psychological point of view." Michels is one of the best-known leaders of Revolutionary Syndicalism.

Among the newer Russian writers, the best is Dr. Michael Tugan-Baranowsky, author of *Der moderne Sozialismus in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung* (Dresden, 1908. O. V. Böhmert). Although the St. Petersburg professor's book is not a large one, we have found it singularly instructive. Eduard Bernstein does justice to its merits in a long review which appeared in the *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft* in May of the present year. Tugan-Baranowsky proclaims himself a Socialist, though not exactly a Marxian Socialist in the strict sense of the word. As Bernstein says, he looks towards a form of Communism as the ultimate solution. Meanwhile, he thinks that the gradual realization of Socialist principles will be the best way of reaching the goal. He is firmly opposed to

the catastrophic theory. He believes that all kinds of work ought, under a Socialist state, to receive equal rewards, with the exception of the specially rough and toilsome tasks, which should be remunerated on a higher scale. In his opinion, Socialists ought to be ready to draw out the plan of their future state. "Without a clear conception of such a State organization," as Bernstein says, "there is no sense in calling oneself a Socialist and in fighting for some unknown end which we call Socialism or Communism."

In the field of Constructive Socialism the following books deserve special mention: *Le Socialisme à l'Œuvre*, edited by Georges Renard;¹ *Neue Staatslehre*, by the late Dr. Anton Menger,² and his small posthumous work *Volkspolitik*. A very interesting book is that of Lucien Deslinières, *L'Application du Système Collectiviste*.³

The smaller books and pamphlets of Georges Renard should not be neglected. They represent the most intelligent and ingenious theories of French Reformist Socialism. We may mention the following: *Le Régime Socialiste*;⁴ *L'Homme est-il libre?*⁵ *Paroles d'Avenir*;⁶ and the well-known series of tracts addressed *To Peasants*, *To Women*, *To Soldiers*, etc.⁷

Three very prolific writers who have scattered much of their best work in ephemeral publications are Jean Jaurès, Émile Vandervelde and Eduard Bernstein. *Études Socialistes*, by M. Jaurès, is a book very widely known.⁸ Parts of it have been translated into English. M. Jaurès writes constantly in the daily newspaper *L'Humanité*.

¹ Paris. Cornély. 1907.

² Jena. Fischer.

³ Librairie de la Revue Socialiste. 1899.

⁴ Félix Alcan.

⁵ Same publisher.

⁶ Société nouvelle de Librairie et d'Édition. 1904.

⁷ Librairie de la Revue Socialiste.

⁸ Paris. Ollendorff. 1902. 6th edition

NOTES ON THE LITERATURE

A well-written biographical study of Jaurès is that of Gustave Téry.¹

M. Vandervelde, the eminent Belgian leader, contributes to all the chief European Socialist reviews. We may recommend especially his volume *Essais Socialistes*,² but the student should know as intimately as possible other books and articles. M. Vandervelde is one of the most illustrious living leaders of Socialism. The great work he has done on behalf of the oppressed Congo slaves endears him to English readers.

Eduard Bernstein is, in the fullest sense of the word, an international writer. We can hardly take up any Socialist magazine without meeting his name. His most noted book is *Die Voraussetzungen des Sozialismus und die Aufgaben der Sozialdemokratie*.³ A volume of his essays was collected in 1900 under the title *Zur Theorie und Geschichte des Socialismus*.⁴ Students of Bernstein should consult a careful article which appeared in the *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft* for March 1909 under the title, "Neuere Schriften von Eduard Bernstein." It is from the pen of Dr. David Koigen.⁵

Bernstein's *Dokumente des Sozialismus* should not be neglected. The bibliographies and lists of magazine articles are especially useful.

On the question of Socialism and Agriculture, a standard work is that of Dr. Eduard David.⁶

A formal list of the English works consulted has not been thought necessary, as full references are given in the notes. The indispensable Socialist newspapers are *The*

¹ Félix Juven. Paris.

² Félix Alcan. Paris. 1906.

³ 12th thousand. 1906. Stuttgart.

⁴ Berlin. Ferd. Dümmler.

⁵ The works reviewed are (1) *Parlamentarismus und Sozialdemokratie*. 1906; (2) *Der Streik; sein Wesen und sein Wirken*; (3) Vols. i. and ii. of Bernstein's *Geschichte der Berliner Arbeiterbewegung*. 1907.

⁶ *Sozialismus und Landwirtschaft*. Berlin. 1903. Verlag der Sozialistischen Monatshefte.

Clarion, the *Labour Leader* and *Justice*. The recently founded *Socialist Review* is full of interesting matter and is watched with careful attention by its foreign contemporaries.

Much has been gathered from the small, pithy volumes of the *Labour Ideal Series*, published by Mr. George Allen. We may mention especially *The Socialist and the City*, by Mr. F. W. Jowett, M.P.; *From Serfdom to Socialism*, by Mr. Keir Hardie, M.P.; *The Socialist's Budget*, by Mr. Philip Snowden, M.P.; *The Socialist's Church*, by the Rev. Stewart D. Headlam; *Labour and the Empire*, by Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald, M.P., and *The Woman Socialist*, by Mrs. Snowden.

The volumes of the Socialist Library, edited by Mr. Ramsay Macdonald,¹ may also be recommended. Mr. Macdonald's own works, especially *Socialism and Society* (1906) and *Socialism* (1907),² should be carefully consulted.

Under the title, *Fabian Socialist Series*,³ some of the most celebrated of the Fabian tracts have recently been published in revised editions.

SOCIALISM AND RELIGION

Some of the earlier literature of "Christian Socialism" is out of date. All that was loftiest and purest in the ideals of Maurice and Kingsley has been absorbed into modern Liberalism. Brentano's well-known book on the Christian Socialist movement in England (1883) possesses only an historic interest. This is true also of the writings of such Continental Christian Socialists as Bishop von

¹ Independent Labour Party, 23 Bride Lane, E.C.

² T. C. and E. C. Jack.

³ A. C. Fifield.

Ketteler and Canon Moufang. We are surprised, in reading such an important book as Nitti's *Catholic Socialism*, by the width of the gulf that separates so-called "Socialism" within the Church of Rome from the ideals of modern social democracy.

The most helpful of recent works on Christian Socialism are, for England, that of Mr. A. V. Woodworth,¹ and for France that of M. Henri Joly.² Father Adderley has published *A Little Primer of Christian Socialism*. Paul Göhre's well-known work, *Die Evangelisch-Soziale Bewegung*, has been translated into English.

Dr. Heinrich Meyer-Benfey's *Friedrich Naumann* is the most useful of the smaller recent German works.³ To those, like the writer, who subscribed regularly to *Die Hilfe* under Naumann's editorship, the little book calls up some happy memories. We may mention also Pastor Martin Wenck's book, *Die Geschichte der National-sozialen*.⁴ A large and important book, written from the general Socialist standpoint, is that published last year by August Erdmann under the title *Die Christliche Arbeiterbewegung in Deutschland*.⁵

A learned series of articles has recently been appearing in the *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft* under the general title, "The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches."⁶ The author is Prof. Ernst Troeltsch of Heidelberg, who is known in this country by his studies in Reformation theology. He has discussed in the *Archiv* the attitude of the Churches towards social questions from the earliest dawn of Christianity. At the time of writing, Prof.

¹ *Christian Socialism in England*. Sonnenschein. 1903.

² *Le Socialisme Chrétien*. Hachette.

³ *Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht*. Göttingen. 1904.

⁴ *Buchverlag der "Hilfe"*. Berlin. 1905.

⁵ J. H. W. Dietz Nachf. Stuttgart. 1908.

⁶ *Die Soziallehren der christlichen Kirchen*.

Troeltsch is entering on the subject of social teaching in the Protestant Churches.

Among works of miscellaneous interest which have been helpful to the writer, the following may be mentioned: *L'Idée du Juste Prix*, by Alfred de Tarde; ¹ *Les Systèmes Socialistes et l'Évolution économique*, by Maurice Bourguin; ² *Le Socialisme en 1907*, by Émile Faguet; *Aus Meinem Leben*, by A. E. F. Schaeffle ³ (very interesting to those who have read Dr. Schaeffle's well-known books on Socialism); *Pamphlets Socialistes*, by Paul Lafargue; ⁴ *Le Déterminisme Économique de Karl Marx*, by Paul Lafargue; ⁵ *Principes Socialistes*, by Gabriel Deville; ⁶ *La Lutte pour la Démocratie*, by Marc Sangnier; ⁷ *Les Démocrates Chrétiens*, by the Abbé Gayraud; ⁸ *L'Œuvre de Millebrand*, by A. Lavy; ⁹ *Travail et Travailleurs*, by A. Millerand; ¹⁰ *New Worlds for Old*, by H. G. Wells; ¹¹ *F. D. Maurice*, by C. F. G. Masterman; ¹² *Modern Socialism*, edited by R. C. K. Ensor (Harpers); *La Comédie Socialiste*; ¹³ *La Tyrannie Socialiste*; ¹⁴ *Sophismes socialistes et Faits économiques*,¹⁵ all three by Yves Guyot.

AMERICAN SOCIALISM

To the *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft* for 1905 (Vol. xx. pp. 633-703) Werner Sombart contributed a long and important study entitled "Quellen und Literatur zum Studium der Arbeiterfrage und des Sozialismus in den Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika (1902-4). This article, which occupies about seventy pages of the *Archiv*, deals

¹ Félix Alcan. 1907.

³ Berlin. 1905. 2 vols.

⁵ Giard et Brière. 1909.

⁷ Perrin et Cie. Paris. 1908.

⁹ Paris. *Société Nouvelle de Librairie et d'Édition*. 1902.

¹⁰ Charpentier. Paris. 1908.

¹² Mowbray. 1907.

¹⁴ Ch. Delagrave. Paris. 1895.

² Armand Colin. 1907. 3rd Edition.

⁴ Giard et Brière. Paris. 1900.

⁶ Giard et Brière. 1898.

⁸ Victor Lecoffre. Paris. 1899.

¹¹ Constable. 1908.

¹³ Charpentier. 1897.

¹⁵ Félix Alcan. Paris. 1908.

with the official publications, the party literature of the trades-unionists, the capitalists who opposed them, the Social Reformers and the Socialists proper. A further section is occupied with American scientific literature on social questions.

The student of American Socialism will find in Prof. Sombart's work an indispensable and thoroughly reliable guide. It is no mere formal list of titles. Almost every one of the more important publications mentioned is discussed with the care of a critical expert, and although the period covered is nominally only three years, the author throws light on the whole field of American Socialism. Prof. Sombart praises especially the work of Morris Hillquit, *History of Socialism in the United States*. Mr. Hillquit, in his view, is a worthy successor to Sartorius von Waltershausen and S. Cognetti de Martiis.

Along with this essay we may mention Werner Sombart's short work, *Warum gibt es in den Vereinigten Staaten keinen Sozialismus?*¹

Among this year's American books the following deserve special praise: *Socialism in Theory and Practice*, by Morris Hillquit;² *Socialism*, by John Spargo,³ and *Socialists at Work*, by Robert Hunter.⁴ The writer has found special pleasure in reading Robert Hunter's new book.

The International Socialist Review of Chicago is well conducted and keeps its readers in touch with the European developments of Socialism.

AUSTRALASIAN SOCIALISM

Students of Australian economic progress will find the most reliable statistics in the recently published *Official*

¹ Tübingen. Mohr.

² Macmillan. 1909.

³ Macmillan. 1909.

⁴ Macmillan. 1909.

Yearbook of the Commonwealth of Australia (1901-1908; No. II., 1909), edited by Mr. G. H. Knibbs, the Commonwealth statistician. This is the latest work which the writer has obtained from official sources. The preface is dated March 31, 1909. The *New Zealand Official Yearbook* (latest edition, 1908) has a chapter on the "Labour Laws of the Dominion," and the *Journal of the Department of Labour*, issued under the direction of the Hon. A. W. Hogg (1909), should also be consulted.

In this field we must once more acknowledge our indebtedness to the *Archiv*. In 1907 two articles appeared under the signature of "Käthe Lux" which deal fully with the literature from 1890 to 1905. The title of the articles is "Arbeiterbewegung und Arbeiterpolitik in Australasien von 1890 bis 1905." The Socialist literature is carefully included. In 1908 Dr. Robert Schachner contributed to the *Archiv* instructive papers on Australian labour questions.¹

A standard book is that of William Pember Reeves, *State Experiments in Australia and New Zealand*.²

The student should consult also *Democracy versus Socialism*, by Max Hirsch (Melbourne);³ *Newest England*, by Henry Demarest Lloyd,⁴ and *La Démocratie en Nouvelle-Zélande*, by André Siegfried.⁵ The frankness of this French writer may be judged by the fact that he entitles one of his chapters, "Le Snobisme dans la Société Néo-Zélandaise."

Dr. Victor S. Clark's book, *The Labour Movement in Australasia*,⁶ is accepted by Australasians as an authoritative work.

¹ *Schiedsgerichte und Lohnausschüsse in Australien.*

² Grant Richards. 1902.

⁴ Gay and Bird. 1902.

⁶ Constable. 1906.

³ Macmillan. 1901.

⁵ Armand Colin. Paris. 1904.

A very interesting new book is that of Mr. A. St. Ledger, *Australian Socialism*.¹

The writer desires to thank Australian Socialist editors who have supplied, for the purpose of this book, newspapers which are not easily accessible in England.

THE LITERATURE OF SYNDICALISM

Although the movement known as "Revolutionary Syndicalism" has grown up in France and Italy during the last ten years only, it has already an extensive literature. The views of its leaders are expressed most fully and ably in *Le Mouvement Socialiste*, Prof. Hubert Lagardelle's magazine. During the years 1899-1904, *Le Mouvement Socialiste* was a general Socialist review; since 1904 it has been the organ of the extremist opinions put forward by Georges Sorel and his school. Among the contributors have been Édouard Berth, Dr. Robert Michels, Arturo Labriola, Enrico Leone, Victor Griffuelhes and Émile Pouget.

A corresponding, though less important, Italian publication is the *Divenire Sociale*, which was founded in Rome in 1905 by Enrico Leone. An authority on Italian Syndicalism, Giuseppe Prezzolini, complains that Leone's organ, as compared with Lagardelle's, is out of direct touch with the working-classes. Various articles from *Le Mouvement Socialiste* have appeared in Italian translations in the *Divenire Sociale*. The work of Robert Michels may be found in both periodicals.

Arturo Labriola's journalistic writings appear chiefly in the *Pagine Libere*, Lugano, but he, like Lagardelle,

¹ Macmillan. 1909.

scatters his work very widely. Among the most interesting of recent essays on Syndicalism were those published in 1908 by Lagardelle in the *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft* under the title "Die syndikalistische Bewegung in Frankreich."

Georges Sorel's writings, especially his *Réflexions sur la Violence* and *La Décomposition du Marxisme* deserve attentive reading. Sorel is almost worshipped by the rank and file of Syndicalists. Prezzolini, whose book, *La Teoria Sindacalista* (1909), contains a careful examination of Sorel's teaching, says that by the unanimous admission of friends and opponents he is "*capo-scuola, messia, profeta, maestro del sindacalismo franco-italiano.*"

Sorel himself owed much to Fernand Pelloutier, the most able organizer of the working-classes that modern France has produced. Pelloutier's opinions approached very near to Anarchism. Like many of the extremer Socialists, he sprang from the middle classes. Tributes to his work may be found in Sorel's writings; and his celebrated book, *Histoire des Bourses du Travail*, has profoundly influenced later writers on French working-class movements. Pelloutier died in the early prime of life amid great bodily affliction (March 1901). Sorel contributed a preface to his *History of the Labour Exchanges*, which appeared posthumously in 1902.

The name of Fernand Pelloutier suggests that of Léon de Seilhac, whose volume, *Syndicats ouvriers, Fédérations, Bourses du Travail* (1902), will be found helpful by the student; and that of Daniel Halévy, author of *Essais sur le Mouvement ouvrier en France* (1901). These books are written in a calm, impartial spirit, and are rich in trustworthy information.

The small red volumes belonging to the *Bibliothèque du Mouvement Socialiste* (Marcel Rivière) should not be neglected. These are chiefly reprints from the magazine. Among those which deserve special mention are No. I., *Syndicalisme et Socialisme*, to which most of the leaders contribute; No. II., *La Confédération Générale du Travail*, by Émile Pouget; No. IV., *L'Action Syndicaliste*, by Victor Griffuelhes, and No. VI., *Les Nouveaux Aspects du Socialisme*, by E. Berth. Sorel's small book, mentioned above, *La Décomposition du Marxisme*, also belongs to this series (No. III.).

A very helpful volume is Lagardelle's collection of articles, etc., reprinted from his magazine, under the title *La Grève Générale et le Socialisme: Enquête Internationale* (Paris. Cornély).

Among recent Italian contributions to the subject, several are mentioned by Prezzolini in his excellent bibliography.¹ These include: *Il Sindacalismo*, by E. Leone (1905); *Che cosa è il Sindacalismo?* by E. Leone (1907); *Riforme e Rivoluzione Sociale*, by A. Labriola (1906); *Il Sindacalismo*, by O. Dinale (1905).

An excellent and very learned work on the general strike is that of Dr. Elsbeth Georgi, *Theorie und Praxis des Generalstreiks in der modernen Arbeiterbewegung* (Fischer. Jena. 1908). It is highly praised by Bernstein in the *Archiv* (May 1909, pp. 809-811). Dr. Georgi coins the word *Klassenstreik* to summarize the many varied conceptions of the general strike, but her choice of this expression does not meet with Herr Bernstein's approval.

We may mention further Mermeix's book, *Le Syndical-*

¹ *La Teoria Sindacalista*. 1909. Naples. Francesco Perrella.

isme contre le Socialisme,¹ and that of Paul Louis, *Histoire du Mouvement Syndical en France* (1907).² From all of these much useful information may be gathered.

¹ Readers of Mermeix's works must be on their guard against occasional blunders and misprints. For instance, he always refers to Fernand Pelloutier as "Frédéric" Pelloutier. He names the author of *News from Nowhere* as "Charles Morice" (*sic*).

² Paul Louis is a trustworthy writer on many phases of Socialism.

CHAPTER I

SOCIALISM IN TRANSITION: OBSOLETE THEORIES

IT is the fashion to say that Marxian Socialism is dead, and time has certainly proved its most destructive critic. Stone after stone, Werner Sombart remarks, was taken out of the stately building, a whole army of moles had long been undermining the soil beneath it, and it fell at last in a night, silently as the Campanile of Venice.¹

We are apt to forget that this great change in the attitude of Socialists towards some of the doctrines of Marx and Engels has been of comparatively recent growth. The spirit of moderation has been slowly spreading in all European countries since the historic Erfurt Congress of 1891, when the German Socialists definitely broke with the more revolutionary section of the party. But it was not till 1897 that Eduard Bernstein raised his voice in a bold and far-reaching criticism of certain Marxian theories. As the close personal friend and literary heir of Engels, as a journalist of commanding ability who had lived much in England and Switzerland and was accustomed to examine all political questions from the international standpoint, Bernstein had at that time, and has still, a large following among the Social Democrats of Germany. He set out his criticisms in Karl Kautsky's magazine, *Die Neue Zeit*, through which the pure spirit of Marx had for

¹ *Sozialismus und Soziale Bewegung*, p. 72, edition of 1908.

fifteen years been distilled. Bernstein's articles, v were republished in the following year in book fo created an immense sensation in Germany, and influence is seen in almost every work on Socialism v has appeared since 1898. In the introduction to his h less famous reply, *Bernstein and the Social Democ Programme*,² Kautsky says that Bernstein's book wa first sensational work which German Socialism had duced. Sensational it may well have appeared to orth Marxians of twelve years ago, for it subjected the dogmas to a relentless criticism based on the fact modern economic experience. Bernstein's long co versy with Kautsky may be followed in its later dev ments in the collected volume of his essays, *On the Th and History of Socialism*,³ and in innumerable mag articles.

In a rejoinder to Kautsky which appeared in *wärts* in October 1899, he represents his opponer sorrowing over his downfall in Ophelia's words Hamlet—

“O, what a noble mind is here o'er-thrown !”

And he defends himself in Hamlet's words to Guil stern—

“I am but mad north-north-west ; when the wind is sout I know a hawk from a handsaw.”¹

What were the principles on which Bernstein and o have brought powerful criticism to bear, and which w now be ranked by many Socialists as more or less obs theories?

¹ The title is *Die Voraussetzungen des Sozialismus und die Aufgaben der Sozialdem*. The edition of 1906 is marked : Twelfth thousand.

² Stuttgart. 1899.

³ Fourth edition, 1904.

⁴ *Zur Theorie und Geschichte des Sozialismus*, Part III., p. 150.

I

*The Theory of a sudden upheaval of society by way of social revolution.*¹

Marx and Engels, it must be remembered, were borne away on the gale of revolutionary passion. They were wandering, disinherited souls, who were dreaming for themselves and humanity of "a Paradise Lost and a Paradise Regained."² The fall of mankind, in their view, was accomplished with the earliest acquisition of private property, and they imagined that the victory of Socialism would restore an Eden bliss, undisturbed by fightings without or within, a high eternal noon of peace and prosperity.³

They fancied that this blissful state would be inaugurated by a terrible revolution in which the disinherited and down-trodden masses would conquer and overthrow their oppressors, taking back for the common enjoyment of mankind all that private property which had been unrighteously acquired by individuals. The practical effect of such teaching, as Bernstein saw, was to paralyze humanity on its path of progress. Just as in the year A.D. 1000 men expected the end of the world and paused from common industry, so the watchers for the Marxian

¹ The expressions *Zusammenbruchstheorie* and *Katastrophentheorie* will be familiar to students of the Bernstein-Kautsky controversy.

² Werner Sombart, *op. cit.* p. 74.

³ Werner Sombart says on this point: "Do not forget that they (Marx and Engels) drew up their doctrines amidst the thunder of the battles of revolution. . . . Think how full a measure of wrath and hate must have gathered itself within the souls of these emigrants, who through all their lives had experienced nothing but mockery, scoffing, hatred, contempt and persecution from their powerful opponents. Try to realize what a supernatural amount of self-discipline and self-control they must have needed if they were not, at every chance that offered, to bite the hated enemy in the calf."—*Op. cit.* p. 75.

revolution stood gazing up into the clouds. Bernstein says: "I have opposed the view that we are approaching a break-up of the present bourgeois society, which may be expected in the near future: and that Social Democrats should determine their tactics by the expectation of such a great social catastrophe or make them relatively dependent upon it."

II

The Theory that Capital is rapidly being concentrated in a few hands, with the result that the masses are becoming more and more impoverished.

The Communist Manifesto was published while England was still in the "hungry forties," and while Europe was passing through the agony of revolution. Marx was an impassioned sympathizer with the people's cause. In his view the suffering of the myriad toilers dominated the past and future. He heard a cry from the people that of Simeon Stylites on his pillar—

"I think that I have borne as much as this—
Or else I dream,—and for so long a time,
If I may measure time by yon slow light
And this high dial, which my sorrow crowns—
So much—even so."

Marx did not see the slow light dawning upon the horizon. He saw the rich growing richer and the poor poorer, until the tortured millions rose in desperation against their oppressors and achieved freedom amidst pain and blood.

Bernstein pointed out, in opposition to Marx, that the fifty years which had elapsed since the publication

the Manifesto, the number of capitalists, far from diminishing, had steadily increased, and that every new capitalist, on however small a scale, became, by the fact of his having something to lose, a recruit to the ranks of the property-holders in the "war of classes."

Bernstein's opponents point to the growth of trusts and the tendency towards the swallowing up of small businesses as proof that Marx was a true prophet. Kautsky complains of "short-breathed criticism" of the master, and believes that time will justify his teaching. That Marx and Engels were completely out in their time-reckoning nobody can deny. A profound and gloomy fatalism governed their philosophy. They believed that the economic and social revolution was controlled by an inexorable necessity, that "high, unobtainable mountains" hemmed man in on every side, leaving him but a narrow margin for free action. They foreshadowed a growth of misery, oppression, serfdom, degeneration and exploitation. The artisan, instead of rising with the progress of industry, was to sink to pauperism, and pauperism was to develop more quickly than population and riches. From pauperism was to be engendered the spirit of revolt, till at last "the hour of capitalistic property strikes, and the expropriators are themselves expropriated."¹

But, as Prof. Sombart remarks, after quoting figures to show the steady increase in the number of capitalists during recent years, "the nearer we get to the moment of the break-up of the capitalistic system, the more 'expropriators' we see swarming around. The business of expropriation will always grow harder!"

The acknowledgment that Marx had erred on points

¹ It has been pointed out that Marx's theory of the concentration of capital was borrowed from Louis Blanc.

of such vital importance meant the vanishing of doctrine of a scientific Socialism.¹

Marx and Engels fancied that they could put a science in the place of the vague dreams of Utopian thinkers. They failed, because there can be no invariable laws governing the Socialist movement.

"The believing Marxist," writes Werner Sombart, "lets to understand that faith, whether religious or political, not seek its justification in any scientific truth, and the refutation of a scientific theory cannot penetrate into deep places in which faith is anchored—into the depths of the heart, where our ideals and our final judgments rest. He understands that the strength of Socialism cannot possibly be rooted in the scientific theses of individual men, even if men were Marx and Engels, but only in the fulness of passion in the will for action, which are ever born anew at the sight of the imperfect state of this world, as compared with our longings and demands."²

III

The Theory that Socialism must necessarily be in antagonism to religion.

At the Erfurt Congress of 1891 it was declared that religious belief was a private concern for the individual with which Socialism, as such, had nothing to do. The question of the relationship between Socialism and religion will occupy us in a later chapter. It is admitted by many of the great non-Christian Socialist writers of the Continent that a remarkable change has taken place.

¹ On the question of a scientific Socialism we may quote the words of Reissert in his essay, *Wie ist wissenschaftlicher Sozialismus möglich?* "I may summarize my views in these words: There is as much scientific Socialism possible as is necessary—that is to say, as much as can reasonably be demanded from the doctrine of movement which aims at creating fundamentally new things."—P. 38.

² *Op. cit.* p. 99.

For many of the elder Socialists the world seemed to be dominated by a fierce imperial eagle, whose two heads—capital and religion—must be struck off before humanity could flourish. Now it is recognized that Socialism and religion have no more to do with each other than Socialism and science. Werner Sombart says: “At the present day, fundamentally hostile views about religion are to be heard only in the circles of half-educated Socialists.”¹

The late Prof. Antonio Labriola wrote that Socialists had more useful and more serious work to do than to be mixing themselves up with followers of Blanqui and Bakunin, “who decreed the abolition of the Divine and guillotined the Almighty in effigy.”² The eminent Italian thinker was himself an unbeliever, and argued that the men of the future would abandon all supernatural religion, accepting the ancient formula, *Primus in orbe deos fecit timor*—It was fear which first made gods in the world. But he did not wish Socialists to embark on an infidel propaganda.

The “Los-von-Marx” (away from Marx) movement becomes yearly more apparent in certain circles. We should, however, be making a grave mistake if we imagined that the critics of the master are deserters from the cause. Kautsky may have had some justification for his statement that Bernstein’s Socialism is only the complete development of Liberalism,³ but the main body of Socialist thinkers desire the ultimate ends towards which Marx pointed, not the less earnestly because they have ceased to repeat his words with superstitious reverence. His errors, they believe, belong to that class of eschatological

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 101.

² *Socialisme et Philosophie*, p. 181.

³ *Bernstein und das Sozialdemokratische Programm*, p. 182.

miscalculations to which the prophets and apostles of all ages have been liable. The central mass of dogma remains unaffected in their view because "we who are alive and remain" may not hope to enter into the full inheritance. The personality of Marx bulks more largely before the world to-day than when he died in March, 1883.

CHAPTER II

THE GENERAL PROGRAMME OF SOCIALISM

THE best starting-point for the student of latter-day Socialism is the year 1898, when the ancient texts were revised with keenest scrutiny after the jubilee of the Communist Manifesto. In that year, while English Socialists were reading Böhm-Bawerk's shrewd criticisms of Marxian economics,¹ while Bernstein was inaugurating the "Los-von-Marx" movement, and Vandervelde was echoing Bernstein, the voice of a distinguished French thinker, Georges Sorel, was heard proclaiming the doctrine of a "return to Marx." In his preface to Merlino's work on *The Forms and Essence of Socialism*,² M. Sorel remarked that the acquisition of political power had profoundly modified Socialist thought and action, but that the essential aims had not been altered. "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life" was at that moment the guiding word of such leaders as Sorel and Merlino. "A return to Marx," wrote M. Sorel, "appears to me to be the watch-word for this moment."³

In later chapters we shall show that Georges Sorel is

¹ Eugen von Böhm-Bawerk, an Austrian ex-Minister of Finance, and Professor of Political Economy in the University of Vienna, published in 1896 a small volume entitled *Zum Abschluss des Marx'schen Systems*, a translation of which was brought out in 1898 by Mr. Fisher Unwin, under the title, *Karl Marx and the Close of his System*. Böhm-Bawerk was, strictly speaking, the predecessor of Bernstein, and his work, within its narrower range, was felt to be conclusive.

² *Formes et Essence du Socialisme*, par Saverio Merlino. Paris. 1898.

³ P. xxxix of the Preface to Merlino's book.

the true philosophic leader of the French and Italian movement towards an extreme form of Socialism, which we know by the name of "Revolutionary Syndicalism."

Nietzsche's phrase, "A new valuation of all the values," might be the motto of Socialism in 1909. It is increasingly understood, for instance, that the moral aspect of Socialism is more important than the material aspect. "Socialism," says a French writer, "may be compared to the Christianity of the first centuries. Like the Christian Church in the age before Constantine, it refuses to accept any of the solutions given by official civilization." The Socialist of to-day does not count too eagerly on events of the near future, for he knows that economic conditions, and even moral ideas, undergo changes with the lapse of time. But he feels, as profoundly as Marx and Engels did, that a catastrophe of some kind threatens our flourishing society, though, unlike them, he does not expect a revolution amidst fire and bloodshed.¹

Dr. John Rae goes somewhat too far, in our opinion, when he suggests that with many of the younger leaders the work of social reform is itself regarded as the social revolution they desire. It is true, as Bebel said, that Socialists are a progressive party and have undergone moultings, but through all changes there persists the determination to take property out of the hands of its present owners into the hands of the State, and that change involves a gradual revolution.

Mr. Keir Hardie's words would be echoed by all his comrades—

¹ We must distinguish clearly, with all the recent writers on Socialism, between "violent" revolutions and revolutions brought about by the process of gradual change, and carried through, nominally at least, by legal methods. "It is doubtful if any of the violent revolutions of history might not have been averted," writes Dr. Flint, "by timely and gradual reforms." On this point, Bernstein and Socialists of his school would probably agree with Dr. Flint.

"In one form or another public must be substituted for private ownership of land and capital. Whether this result is to be attained by State Socialism, or by free voluntary association, like our co-operative movement, or, as seems most likely, by a combination of both, is a point upon which a healthy difference of opinion may exist; but the difference concerns the method to be employed, not the end itself, upon which all are agreed, viz. that the useful classes must own the tools wherewith they labour, and be free to enjoy the full produce of their labour."¹

Socialists who have abandoned the catastrophic theory might be willing, we should naturally suppose, to accept gradual changes by way of social reform. The wisest are willing; but even they accept the scanty doles only as an earnest of further gains. Such leaders as Karl Kautsky warn the workers earnestly against the danger of overestimating the value of social reform. Kautsky advises the working-men to look closely at any social reforms which are offered them, for, as he adds, "nineteenths of the proposals for reform are not only useless, but are directly injurious to the exploited masses."²

In this sentence we have a summary of the teaching of Socialist leaders at home who wish to dissuade the working-men from voting with the Liberals. Granted, they say, that there is to be no revolution in the ordinary sense of the word, the dawn of revolution does not break through eastern windows only, and the only eyes which will miss it are those that refuse to open. To such minds as

¹ *From Serfdom to Socialism*, pp. 95, 96.

² *Das Erfurter Programm*, edition of 1907, p. 107. Though an orthodox Marxian on most points, Kautsky is an evolutionist in his preference for peaceful action. The great change, he says, is in no way necessarily bound up with acts of violence.

Dr. Flint's objection to Littré's definition of Socialism in his dictionary still holds good. Littré defined Socialism as "a system which, regarding political reforms as of subordinate importance, offers a plan of social reform." "This is," says Dr. Flint, "to identify Socialism with social reform, than which nothing can be more inaccurate. Socialism generally claims to be social revolution, and not merely social reform."—*Socialism*, p. 15.

Kautsky's, every offer of amelioration is like a narcotic pressed to the lips of waking men.

The merchants of the Valley of Diamonds, who picked up a few chance gems from the eagles' nests, saw with amazement the rich booty of Sinbad, who had actually been in the valley. Socialists of Kautsky's school fill their bags half contemptuously with the jewels of Liberal legislation, while their eyes are peering all the while over the cliffs to the inaccessible places where the real treasures are lying.

As might be expected, there are endlessly varying opinions in the party with regard to social reform. To some, it is a bait for vote-catching; to others, a trap to ensnare the wealthy, whose opposition is counted on as a means of increasing the hostility between them and the workers. Yet another view was expressed by the Socialist deputies to the Reichstag in their report to the Berlin Congress of 1892: "What can be got for working-men by Parliamentary action is a mere viaticum to sustain them on the march forward, a mere instalment, which serves to furnish the proletariat with a little more of the means of battle which they require in order to fulfil their historical mission."³

Between the true Socialists and those whom they contemptuously call "*les bons socialistes*" there is now, as ever, a deep gulf fixed. Kautsky describes the social reformers as quacks who pretend that they can cure in a few days, without pain and without expense, the most deeply-seated social maladies.¹

It is not any foolish *intransigence* which leads some chieftains of Socialism to view with scornful and suspicious eyes the measures of Liberal Governments. These men

¹ *Das Erfurter Programm*, p. 105.

believe that our present economic conditions must undergo a radical change before the enslaved millions can be set free. The idea of a modern slavery is profoundly rooted in the ideas of the great Socialist thinkers. The late Dr. Anton Menger, who was, like Antonio Labriola, hostile to the Christian faith, confessed that the first effort to uplift the down-trodden multitudes which won at least an outward success was the development of Christianity.¹ He argued, however, that the condition of the Roman Empire was unfavourable to the acceptance of Christian social doctrines.

“If we consider that at that time one man held despotic sway over the entire known world, that everywhere throughout the Roman Empire there was a comparatively small number of freemen amidst a vast multitude of slaves, that even the free citizens were divided into classes which included the overwhelmingly rich and the penniless, we can feel no surprise that the primitive Christians lost courage to set themselves against such an ocean of wrong and violence, and to win for the poor their rights even in this world. For that reason, and because the miraculous return of Christ did not take place, the Kingdom of God, for which they had been striving, was very soon postponed to a life beyond the grave, in which human destinies were to be justly balanced.”²

The thought of the burdens of the people weighs as heavily on modern Socialists as on the ancient prophets of Israel. So-called economic freedom is, in many cases, a mere delusion. The slave and the villein of old days were cherished even for selfish motives by the master, who, if not a madman, would naturally wish to preserve his own goods and chattels. The slave, passing from hand to hand, was sure of his livelihood, because it was in the interest of successive masters to feed, clothe and shelter him. The

¹ *Neue Staatslehre*, p. 4.

² *Ibid.* p. 4.

free labourer, who possesses none of the means of production, stands helplessly in the market-place. Rodbertu wrote words which modern optimists cannot refute—

“The personal freedom of to-day is for most men no more than a continuous dependence on the individual will of others, the individual morality of others—dependence on the will and moral character of the owners of land and capital; servile subordination.”

Though it is true that the workers are in the market acquiring more wealth than they once had, Dr. Menger and other thinkers point out that vast multitudes in the twentieth century are in no way better off—they may be worse off—than the slave or the feudal vassal. Such writers scoff, and with good reason, at the idea that the French Revolution brought any liberation to the proletariat. It was essentially an uprising of the middle classes against the aristocracy. The “Haves” gained the “Have-nots” continued to wear the chains which at the best were newly gilded.¹

¹ Thus Dr. Menger says: “*Die ökonomischen Fesseln, welche die bestuhllosen Volksklassen drückten, wurden nur neu bemalt, nicht gebrochen*”—The economic fetters which pressed upon the non-property classes of the people were only newly painted, not broken. *Neue Staatslehre*, p. 5.

Mr. Ramsay MacDonald says: “The speeding up of machinery and the increase in the rapidity of work compel the labourer to give more and more of himself in service for which he receives wages; the liberties which he theoretically enjoys when he is not in the factory or at the bench, become, in consequence, of diminished value and reality: the absence of the slave’s claim upon his master for service becomes a greater and more pressing grievance. His life is spent in servitude.” *Socialism*, p. 15.

Jules Guesde is an extremist, but his words in this connection are worth noting. “Ninety-nine hundredths of the human race are reduced to a state of virtual, if not nominal slavery. They exist only for the sake of others, and only so far as it is in the interest of others that they should exist. When I speak of slavery, I keep within the mark, for the slave of olden times, who represented a monetary value because he had to be bought, had as much right to be supported and maintained by his master as the horses, oxen and other animals, which provided the means of his enjoyment.”—*Collectivisme et Révolution*.

De Quincey’s words on the opium-eating of Coleridge might be applied to the servitude of humanity, as Socialists conceive it: “Still at intervals, through the gloom

Mr. Chiozza Money has estimated that the national income of the United Kingdom is divided with startling inequality. The population is roughly estimated at 43,000,000, and the income at £1,710,000,000, but of this sum £585,000,000 is absorbed by $1\frac{1}{4}$ millions of the rich, £245,000,000 by $3\frac{3}{4}$ millions of the comfortable, while the remaining £880,000,000 is divided amongst 38 million people.

The terrible facts of unemployment in the United Kingdom, as given by Mr. Chiozza Money, show that the workman is ruthlessly "made to bear the chief burden of bad trade," and that "even in the best years there is always a surplus of unemployed labour." Even in the case of highly-skilled workmen uncertainty eats away the energies. Twenty shillings and sixpence was estimated as the average weekly wages of the manual workers in 1903, and in the workers' wage-earning year from six to ten weeks at least are lost through sickness, bad weather or accident.

Socialists can derive little satisfaction from a comparison of the present industrial conditions with those of forty years ago.

"We see that the average wage has risen," writes Mr. Chiozza Money, "but also that it now amounts to but £45 per annum. We see that prices have fallen, but remember that in 1905 one-third of our population, in spite of lower prices, have not sufficient means to command a proper supply of the common necessities of existence."

"We say," writes Mr. Blatchford, replying to Lord
 vigils of his prison, you hear muttered growls of impotent mutineering swelling upon
 the breeze—

"Irasque leonum
 Vincula recusantum"—

recusantum, it is true, still refusing, yet still accepting, protesting for ever against the
 fierce, overmastering curb-chain, yet for ever submitting to receive it into the mouth."

Balfour of Burleigh, "that there ought not to be any poor and that there need not be any poor; and that there would not be any poor if our Christians were not infidels and our wealthy classes were not hogs."¹

Socialists are determined not to acquiesce in the deterioration of multitudes of the working classes under the present capitalist system. It may be useful to recall here the points of reform fixed upon by Marx and Engels in the Communist Manifesto as the programme for the more civilized countries.

(1) Abolition of property in land, and the application of ground-rents to public purposes.

(2) A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.

(3) Abolition of all rights of inheritance.

(4) Confiscation of the property of emigrants and rebels.

(5) Centralization of credit in the hands of the State by means of a national bank, with State capital and an exclusive monopoly.

(6) Centralization of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the State.

(7) Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the State, the bringing of waste lands into cultivation, and improvement of the soil generally.

(8) The equal obligation upon all to labour. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.

(9) Combination of agriculture with the manufacturing industries, etc.

(10) Free education for children in public schools, and abolition of child-labour in factories, etc.

The immediate aim of Socialism to-day is more comprehensively expressed than in the Communist Manifesto. Its cardinal principle is that the State should take out of private ownership the means of production, distribution and exchange. This single sentence contains the quintessence of the creed drawn up at Socialist Congresses. The workers, as Socialists believe, can be lifted out

¹ *Clarion*, February 28, 1908.

their present misery only by the establishment of a "democratic Work-State." This policy has its destructive and its constructive side, destructive in its schemes for getting rid of the present capitalist society, constructive in the regulations already foreshadowed for the new order. The first and greatest problem of destructive Socialism is that of dispossessing the present owners of property.

CHAPTER III

SOCIALISTS AND EXPROPRIATION

EDUARD BERNSTEIN complains, with good reason, that Socialists of his school are constantly thwarted in argument by critics of the type of Mrs. Wilfer, in *Our Mutual Friend*.¹ Our readers will remember that Mrs. Wilfer, on hearing of Bella's engagement to John Rokesmith, remarks to cherubic Pa, "Your daughter Bella has bestowed herself upon a Mendicant." After explanations, Mr. Wilfer says—

"‘Would you object to my pointing out, my dear, that Mr Rokesmith is not (so far as I am acquainted with him), strictly speaking, a Mendicant.’"

"‘Indeed,’ returned Mrs. Wilfer, with an awful air of politeness, ‘Truly so? I was not aware that Mr. John Rokesmith was gentleman of landed property. But I am much relieved to hear it.’"

"‘I doubt if you *have* heard it, my dear,’ the Cherub submitted with hesitation.

"‘Thank you,’ said Mrs. Wilfer. ‘I make false statements it appears. So be it. If my daughter flies in my face, surely my husband may. The one thing is not more unnatural than the other. There seems a fitness in the arrangement. By all means!—assuming, with a show of resignation, a deadly cheerfulness.’"

¹ The passage is worth giving in the original. "Der grosse englische Humorist Dickens hat in einem seiner Romane diese Art zu disputiren sehr gut charakterisirt. ‘Deine Tochter hat einen Bettler geheirathet,’ sagt eine, in d rflichen Verh ltnissen lebende, etwas gross-spurige Dame zu ihrem Manne, und als dieser ihr erwidert, der neue Schwiegersonn sei doch nicht gerade ein Bettler, erh lt er die vernichtend-sarkastische Antwort: So? Ich w nschte nicht, dass er grosse Liegenschaften bes tze." *Die Voraussetzungen des Sozialismus*, pp. 172, 173.

Impartial students of Socialism know the Mrs. Wilfers, and agree with Bernstein that there is nothing to be done with them. They are the people who, on hearing that Socialists mean to touch property, cry in agonized tones: "Even needles must cease to be private possessions."¹ No man under Socialism could be allowed to possess a spade or a hammer. Every tool must be taken from the communal tool-house. "If a man wanted to nail up a picture in his own room—assuming that he was allowed to call any room his own—he would have to make application at the Town Hall for the temporary use of a hammer and the permanent grant of one brass-headed nail." "*There seems a fitness in the arrangement. By all means!*"

Now it is perfectly true, and the fact cannot be too clearly acknowledged, that Socialism does mean to touch property. Herein lies its chief distinction from the old Radicalism. Mermeix observes very truly that the Roman senators, seated on their curule chairs, were not more scandalized when the comrades of Brennus pulled their beards than were Radicals when voices were raised in criticism of the rights of individual property.²

The true feeling of Socialists as regards the present capitalistic system may be gathered from innumerable passages in their latest writings.

Karl Kautsky says: "Continuance in capitalistic civilization is impossible; we must either go forward to Socialism or backward to barbarism."³

In another passage he remarks: "The even more press-

¹ Article by Mr. Harold Cox, M.P., in *Daily Mail Year Book* for 1908, p. 68.

² *Le Socialisme*, 1907. 4th edition. (Ollendorff) pp. 7, 8. Mermeix takes as the motto of his book the saying of Marx: "Our teaching may be summed up in this proposition—the abolition of private property." He says: "Pour quiconque ne veut pas abolir la propriété privée, il n'y a pas de question sociale."

³ *Das Erfurter Programm*, p. 137.

ing necessity of economic development is to replace the private right of property in the means of production by co-operative possession.”¹

Mr. Keir Hardie writes—

“Socialism says to the worker, It is not the State which holds you in bondage, it is the private monopoly of those means of life without which you cannot live, and until you make these means of life the common property and inheritance of all you can never hope to escape from your bondage. The economic object of Socialism, therefore, is to make land and industrial capital common property, and to cease to produce for the profit of the landlord and the capitalist, and to begin to produce for the use of the community.”²

Mr. Ramsay Macdonald says—

“The nationalization of production is just as necessary to democracy—and just as inevitable, if democracy is to mature into fulness—as the nationalization of the sovereign authority by the suppression of the personal right of kings to rule. We must look upon production as a national function, and not as a task assigned to a class of separate individuals pursuing their own ends.”³

Dr. Menger says—

“This transference of the rights of property from the individual to a narrower or wider community must be regarded as the characteristic point of the social programme. By this Socialism is clearly differentiated from the efforts of the merely reforming parties, who wish only to improve the traditional order of things while maintaining its principles intact.”⁴

Mr. H. G. Wells says—

“Collective ownership is the necessary corollary of collective responsibility. There are to be no private landowners, no private

¹ *Das Erfurter Programm*, p. 112.

² *From Serfdom to Socialism*, p. 9. George Allen. 1907.

³ *Socialism*, pp. 83, 84. T. C. and E. C. Jack. 1907.

⁴ *Neue Staatslehre*, p. 24.

bankers and lenders of money, no private insurance adventurers, no private railway owners nor shipping owners, no private mine owners, oil kings, silver kings, coal and wheat forestallers, or the like. All this realm of property is to be resumed by the State—is to be State owned and State managed.”¹

In the view of modern leaders there are two kinds of property—the non-socializable and the socializable. Socialists do not propose to touch property which is required for necessary personal consumption.

I

The Property that Socialists do not Claim for the State

The word Property, it is often said, has been used in nearly as many senses as the word Law. Socialists divide the things in which property rights may exist into means of production and means of consumption. Their practical aim is to secure the ownership of the means of production for the community and of the means of consumption for the individual. This central purpose is so clearly brought out in the recent international Socialist literature that only wilful ignorance, we are tempted to think, explains the “spade and needle terrorism” of the Mrs. Wilfer school.

Mr. Graham Wallas speaks for the most thoughtful Socialist teachers in all countries when he says: “Men are as yet more fit for association in production with a just distribution of its rewards, than for association in the consumption of the wealth produced.”² It is Collectivism, not Communism, which the new Socialists desire.

The fullest and simplest discussion of the subject is contained in a book recently edited by M. Georges Renard,

¹ *New Worlds for Old*, p. 89. Constable. 1908.

² *Socialism*. Edited by G. Bernard Shaw. Essay on “Property under Socialism.”

Le Socialisme à l'Œuvre ¹ [*Socialism at Work*]. No moderate Socialist, as this book shows, desires to apply the principle of *étatisation* to the objects of personal use.

M. Renard and his collaborators write in the same strain as Mr. Wells in a recent volume—

“We must not suppose that all possessions can be socialized. There is a very important class of possessions which, by their very nature, are destined to remain always private property. These include, amongst the possessions which satisfy the needs of men, such property as perishes, either at once or in a comparatively short time, even as it does so. To this class belong food, clothing, etc.” ²

All this “consumable property” lies, even for the extremer modern thinkers, outside the range of Proudhon’s famous saying: “Property is theft.”

The following passage by Mr. Wells might be echoed from foreign writers—

“Every adult now-a-days has private property in his or her own person, in clothes, in such personal implements as hand-tools, as a bicycle, as a cricket-bat or golf-sticks. In quite the same sense would he have it under Socialism, so far as these self-same things go. The sense of property in such things is almost instinctive: my little boys of five and three have the keenest sense of *mine* and (almost, if not quite so vividly) *thine* in the matter of toys and garments. The disposition of modern Socialism is certainly no more to over-ride these natural tendencies than it is to fly in the face of human nature in regard to the home.” ³

M. Renard, who is the most ingenious of Socialist architects, has built a half-way house for the owners of literary and artistic property.⁴

¹ Paris: Cornély. 1907.

² *Le Socialisme à l'Œuvre*, p. 106.

³ *New Worlds for Old*, pp. 142, 143.

⁴ See the chapter on “La Propriété intellectuelle.”—*Op. cit.* p. 109.

II

The Property that must be Socialized

The property which fills the halls of Socialism with "a clangorous cry of wrath and lamentation" belongs to a different category. It is the type of property which ought never, as Socialists claim, to have belonged to private individuals, the wealth which was destined for the use of all mankind, and which, by a process of exploitation, has fallen into the hands of the few. We find such a leader as the late Dr. Menger quoting even Machiavelli's statement that there can be no true life of freedom in any State where there are many citizens who live not by their work, but by the income they enjoy in idleness.¹

Jules Guesde startled the French Chamber in the session of 1896 by quoting the words of John Stuart Mill: "Capital is necessary to production, but not the capitalist."² To the great ground-landlords, the wealthy financiers, the kings of commerce, the message of Socialism, now, as in the time of the Communist Manifesto, might be summed up in St. James's warning to the rich: "Ye have laid up your treasure in the last days. . . . Ye have nourished your hearts in a day of slaughter."

The first person to be expropriated under Socialism would be the ground landlord. All property in land would be resumed by the State, except (a most important exception, to which we shall recur in a later chapter) the little holding of the peasant proprietor, who is the special pet of the newer theorists. The great manufacturers would be forced to surrender their rights in the "means of pro-

¹ *Neue Staatslehre*, p. 243.

² A full report of this very interesting debate was issued as a pamphlet by Messrs. Cornély, Paris.

duction," their warehouses and plant. M. Renard suggests, however, that the State might choose to leave individual owners or companies in charge of large undertakings for at least a time, on the understanding that they did their work as servants of the community, and not for their private profit. He blames Socialists for having given themselves away to the critics who contend that the "democratic work-state" would be a highly centralized bureaucracy. Not necessarily, thinks M. Renard; why should not the State resume the means of production, and then lay on the shoulders of experienced agents the burden of the practical working? ¹

Besides the land and the great industries, Socialists propose to take over all means of transport, including, of course, the railways, where these are not already State-owned. On this last point there are signs that a large section even of Conservative opinion goes with them, if only in the hope of securing better dividends to shareholders than some of the railways are paying at this moment. The taking over of mines, banks and insurance companies is discussed at length by many writers, while it need hardly be said that on the question of such public services as the water, gas, electric light, and milk supply, the Socialist agrees with the municipal Progressive. M. Renard, like Mr. Wells, believes that the drink trade ought to be controlled by the public authority. Socialists aim at a better regulation of all businesses on which the health of the public depends. They would abolish private bakeries, slaughter-houses, etc.

The tremendous difficulties in the way of even the most modest expropriation are apparent to thoughtful Socialists. As soon as any interest is attacked, an army is mobilized

¹ *Op. cit.* pp. 126, 127.

for its defence, and the solidarity of the propertied classes and their dependents becomes apparent. This is why some who still call themselves Socialists have fallen back on a timid and calculating policy. The State, as they prove from history, has a right to take over private property, and on many occasions has exercised the right.¹ But when schemes for expropriation are discussed, we find remarkable divergences of opinion.

There are three obvious ways in which socialization might be accomplished: (1) by voluntary surrender; (2) by confiscation; (3) by repurchase or compensation.

We have not been able to discover even among the optimists of Socialism any expectation that a new Fourth of August² is dawning on the horizon. The "Haves" will not surrender their property "on the altar of the fatherland." If ever Socialists dreamt of a time when

"The full-juiced apple, waxing over-mellow,
Drops in a silent autumn night,"

they have learned long ago that property is not like that apple. It holds and is likely to hold, tenaciously to the twig.

Kautsky warns his followers that it will not be enough to sit still with open mouths and "wait for the roast pigeons to fly in." Between the other alternatives—confiscation or compensation—Socialists will have to choose.

¹ See Mr. Bruce Glasier's interesting article in *The Labour Leader* for February 28, 1908.

² On August 4, 1789, French property-owners made a great act of renunciation.

CHAPTER IV

THE QUESTION OF COMPENSATION

PAUL LAFARGUE, a son-in-law of Marx, in the preface to his famous pamphlet on *The Right to be Lazy*,¹ which makes a stronger appeal *ad hominem* than almost any other piece of Socialist argument, quotes a remarkable saying of M. Thiers in 1849 before the Commission on Elementary Education. "I wish to make the influence of the clergy all-powerful," said Thiers, "because I depend upon them to spread that good philosophy which teaches man that he is here on earth to suffer, and not that other philosophy, which says, on the contrary, to man, Enjoy." "M. Thiers," wrote Lafargue, "was formulating the moral teaching of the bourgeois class, whose fierce selfishness and narrow intellect were incarnated in his person. . . . Capitalist morality—a pitiful parody of Christian morality—lays a curse upon the body of the worker; its ideal is to restrict the producer to the lowest possible minimum of needs, to suppress his joys and his passions, and to condemn him to play the part of the machine which turns out its work, without pause and without pity."

Sayings like that of M. Thiers, skilfully annotated by Socialist leaders of the type of Lafargue and Guesde, might

¹ *Le Droit à la Paresse*, which M. Paul Leroy-Beaulieu described as "An Ode to Laziness," has been translated into almost every European language, including Russian and Polish. Our quotation is taken from *Pamphlets Socialistes*, par Paul Lafargue. Giard et Brière. Paris, 1900.

be trusted to awaken the passion for confiscation in the soberest breasts. Life, according to such teachers, is our one opportunity for enjoyment, and it is a monstrous injustice that while the few are rich and free, the masses should bend their necks under the yoke of perpetual labour. Jules Guesde says: "The wage-earning system cannot be improved, because it is unimprovable. It must be destroyed."¹ In his view the alternative to Socialism is a far more cruel type of capitalism than that of the nineteenth century—a capitalism "freed from the old restraints of religion, worse than mediæval serfdom."

"Revisionists" of the type of Bernstein and Turati, and even true Marxians of the modern intellectual school, reject, however, the idea of confiscating the property of the rich, and declare their adherence to some form or other of compensation, though many of them regard the compensation of property-owners as a regrettable necessity.²

I

Reluctant Compensators

Mr. R. B. Suthers, in a recent article in the *Clarion*,³ asks the question, Do we propose to pay compensation for land and industries nationalized? Immediately he veers away from the point. "The question is not, 'Do we propose to pay compensation?' The question is, 'How long are we going to allow the present confiscation to continue?'"

¹ *Collectivisme et Révolution*.

² Marx himself, as M. Jaurès reminds us, said that the social revolution would be most cheaply purchased if the present owners of capital could be indemnified. "He meant," adds Jaurès, "that from the point of view of self-interest it would be well that revolutionary Socialism should avoid exasperating to the uttermost the old society which was expropriated, and the long devastating convulsions of dying wealth."—*Études Socialistes*, p. 8.

³ January 24, 1908.

How do we propose to reduce the amount of confiscation until it is abolished? ” He proceeds to estimate that our present system has allowed 5,000,000 people to accumulate ten hundred millions of the national income, while the rest of the population, 39,000,000, own only six hundred millions.

Writers of this school can never mention compensation without a sneer. “We would rather kill a thousand babies,” says Mr. Suthers ironically, “than deprive a rich man of the motor-cars he buys with the rents he does not earn.”

Mr. Blatchford’s language on compensation is cautious and grudging. “For the landlord to speak of confiscation in the face of the laws of patent and of copyright seems to me the coolest impudence.”¹

He is prepared, however, to give reasonable compensation to landowners, and presumably also to industrial capitalists. “We deny,” says the wizard in *The Sorcery Shop*, “that any man has a moral or legal right to own our country, or any part of it; but we do not propose to take all he possesses without any payment, and leave him to starve.”

Do we exaggerate in saying that there is a class of Socialist thinkers who are determined to concede as little as possible by way of compensation to property-holders, and whose chief fear is that the Socialist State may be inaugurated by one more huge “act of plunder”—carried out, as of old, they would say, at the expense of the people?

¹ *The Sorcery Shop*, p. 174.

II

More Generous Socialist Views on Compensation

It may be fairly claimed, however, that many English and Continental Socialists are willing to make full and liberal terms with the present owners of property. Writing on the land question, Mr. Bernard Shaw says—

“The Nationalizers will declare for its annexation by the Municipality without compensation; but that will be rejected as spoliation, worthy only of revolutionary Socialists. The no-compensation cry is indeed a piece of catastrophic insurrectionism, for whilst compensation would be unnecessary and absurd if every proprietor were expropriated simultaneously, and the proprietary system at once replaced by full-blown Socialism, yet when it is necessary to proceed by degrees, the denial of compensation would have the effect of singling out individual proprietors for expropriation whilst the others remained unmolested, and depriving them of their private means long before there was suitable municipal employment ready for them. The land, as it is required, will therefore be honestly purchased; and the purchase money, or the interest thereon, will be procured, like the capital, by taxing rent.”¹

Mr. H. G. Wells is not less broad-minded.

“The earlier Socialism,” he says, “was fierce and unjust to owners. ‘Property is robbery,’ said Proudhon, and right down to the nineties Socialism kept too much of the spirit of that proposition. The property-owner was to be promptly and entirely deprived of his goods, and to think himself lucky he was not lynched forthwith as an abominable rascal. The first Basis of the Fabian Society, framed so lately as 1884, seems to repudiate ‘Compensation,’ even a partial compensation of property-owners, though in its practical proposals the Fabian Society has always admitted compensatory arrangements. . . . We live to-day in a vast tradition of relationships in which the rightfulness of that kind of private property is assumed, and suddenly, instantly, to deny and abolish it would be—I write this as a convinced and

¹ *Socialism. Fabian Essays. Transition*, p. 195.

thorough Socialist—quite the most dreadful catastrophe human society could experience. . . . There is no reason why a cultivated property-owner should not welcome and hasten [the coming of Socialism]. Modern Socialism is prepared to compensate him, not perhaps ‘fully,’ but reasonably, for his renunciations.”¹

Mr. Sidney Webb writes—

“There is, indeed, much to be said in favour of the liberal treatment of the present generation of proprietors, and even of their children. But against the permanent welfare of the community the unborn have no rights; and not even a living proprietor can possess a vested interest in the present system of taxation.

“The democracy may be trusted to find, in dealing with the landlord, that the resources of civilization are not exhausted. An increase in the death duties, the steady rise of local rates, the special taxation of urban ground values, the graduation and differentiation of the income tax, the simple appropriation of the unearned increment, and the gradual acquirement of land and other monopolies by public authorities, will in due course suffice to ‘collectivize’ the bulk of the tribute of rent and interest in a way which the democracy will regard as sufficiently equitable, even if it does not satisfy the conscience of the proprietary class itself.”²

Eduard Bernstein, as might be expected, has written emphatically in favour of compensation.

“Rights of property which are admitted by the common law,” he says, “must be inviolable in every community, as long as and in proportion as the common law admits them. To take over legally-held property without compensating the owners is confiscation, which can only be justified in a case of extraordinary pressure of circumstances, such as arises from war or pestilence.”³

Kautsky, also, while remarking with a touch of his master’s fatalism, that “the unexpected plays the chief

¹ *New Worlds for Old*, pp. 162, 163.

² *Socialism and Individualism*, p. 16. “The Fabian Socialist” Series, No. 3, 1908. A. C. Ffifield.

³ *Die Voraussetzungen des Sozialismus*, pp. 161, 162.

part in historical development," agrees, on the whole, with Bernstein on this question of compensation. "On no account can we say that the carrying out of the Social Democratic programme demands, under all circumstances, that the property which must be taken away from its present owners, should be confiscated."¹

The truth is that the newer Socialists, having accepted, more or less frankly, the principle of compensation, are now engaged in adjusting the tremendous burden to the shoulders of that visionary Atlas, the Socialist Commonwealth.

III

Difficulties of Compensation as Foreseen by Socialists

We discover, even in the writings of moderate leaders, echoes of that fierce pamphlet in which Jules Guesde declares the impossibility of all schemes for repurchase or indemnity. The principle of compensation being admitted, how shall the democratic Work-State find the means of buying out the property-owners? We have not got the means, says Guesde, and if we had, where is the guarantee that the capitalists would agree to the bargain? If an indemnity were paid by annuities, interest or otherwise, the same idle classes would flourish at the expense of the community, and socialization would be achieved at too vast a cost. The worker, who was formerly crushed by the wage-system, would now be overwhelmed by taxation. Would the new State consent to go on feeding indefinitely an army of parasites?

The ablest discussion of the details of compensation is

¹ *Das Erfurter Programm*, p. 149.

that of Kautsky in his pamphlet, *The Morrow of Revolution*. He assumes that the capitalists and ground landlords will be bought out, and asks what advantage the workers will in that case derive from expropriation? He foresees the piling up of a gigantic national debt, but expects this to be gradually extinguished by taxation and death duties. The wealthy, who now have many ways of cheating the Treasury, would have no means of escaping the pitiless Socialist Chancellor of the Exchequer. The State would have made itself responsible for the value of the property taken from them, but by a course of taxation which might, as Kautsky admits, require several decades for its full working, they would gradually be stripped of everything. Expropriation by attrition is at the basis of Kautsky's plan. At present, says the editor of *Die Neue Zeit*, excessive taxation might have the effect of driving the rich out of the country. Not so under the Socialist State, for the pensioners would have no liberty of action. The Article of the Communist Manifesto, which ordered the confiscation of the property of emigrants and rebels, would be swiftly put in action against them. By quitting the country they would forfeit all claims upon the State, and would lose both interest and title deeds.

By this scheme of a national debt and the payment of a heavily-taxed interest to former owners, Kautsky supposes that confiscation will lose its uglier characteristics. "People will grow accustomed to it; it will seem less painful." Some might compare such a policy to that of burglars who, having decided to rob a house, in consideration for the feelings of the inmates, take away one piece of plate at a time. Mermeix, commenting on Kautsky's scheme, remarks on the intense disturbance which such a process, continued for decades, would produce in the new State,

alike in industrial concerns and in the national budget. "Is it likely," he asks, "that the Workers' State, which would be struggling during the period of transition with tremendous financial embarrassments, would agree to pay for decades the interest on that overwhelming debt? Would it not grow tired of keeping up a parasitic class? . . . This would be expecting a great deal from the patience of working-men who had been taught that all property, all capital comes from the spoliation of the working classes. Is it likely that they would go on fattening those who once robbed them, when the power was theirs to escape such a tribute?"¹

The owners of property, it may be added, need expect very little from Socialist promises of repurchase or large indemnity. No scheme yet proposed, as their own writers admit, will bear the test of close examination.

Some of the strongest Socialists, like Rignano, admit the force of M. Paul Leroy-Beaulieu's arguments on the impossibility of the State's buying out the land-owners. The French economist shows that there is not sufficient circulating capital to correspond to the value of the land, and that under a Socialist system of repurchase the expropriated owners would have to be paid in "*titres de rente*." The mere machinery which would have to be set up for any system of repurchase would, in his view, constitute a heavy burden for the State. Rignano quotes this passage in full and agrees with it.

We see, then, (1) that the best minds among the newer Socialists are prepared for compensation on a more or less liberal scale, but that (2) there is no general agreement as to details, no clear understanding as to where the money will come from. A sentence we have quoted above from

¹ *Le Socialisme*, p. 256.

Mr. Sidney Webb passes rapidly before our view some of those purses filled with glittering coin into which Socialists hope to dip. There is something better than a purse—a whole mine of treasure—waiting, in their opinion, to be secured by interference with the law of inheritance.

CHAPTER V

THE QUESTION OF INHERITANCE

THE new Socialists recognize that it is not possible to dispossess the present owners of property "in a long night-sitting" (to quote a phrase of Victor Adler). They are, therefore, considering the possibilities of expropriation by attrition, and their most daring thinkers have already abolished in imagination the existing laws of inheritance.

We must note, as a preliminary point, that while these laws, in the intention of Socialists, are to be abrogated, or greatly modified, for the private citizen, the coming State, by a singular paradox, is to draw its vitality from ancient springs.

I

The Socialist State is Itself to be an Heir

The most scholarly French book on property published during the last six years from the Socialist standpoint is that of Prof. Ernest Tarbouriech.¹ While accepting the fullest Socialist teaching, this writer explains that many features of the old capitalist *régime* will survive under the new order.

"Collectivism, no less than capitalism, will recognize some forms of property which have been borrowed from

¹ *Essai sur la Propriété*. Giard et Brière, Paris, 1904.

earlier economic systems.”¹ M. Tarbouriech denies that any sharp line can be drawn between public and private property.

“In the gamut of many thousand shades which we admire in the Gobelins tapestries, the only colours lacking are black and white. But each of the primary colours yields to the weaver a manifold variety of shades, which pass by imperceptible transitions from the darkest to the lightest, from the deepest red which serves for black, to the palest pink which can be used as white.”²

The point of the metaphor is that the property which is already most highly socialized yields personal joy to individuals, while the possessions which Socialism would leave in private hands have a certain public value. “No individual property is without a trace of collectivism. No Communistic order has been wholly free from individualism. . . . It is probable that future codes of law will allow to our descendants some forms of property in the sense in which we have understood the word.”³

“It is a great law of history that one social order shall borrow from another. . . . It seems to me that social buildings are constructed not so much with materials specially quarried for them, as with stones borrowed from other houses; recut, indeed, and adapted according to the ever-changing needs. In the social, as in the physical order, nothing is lost, nothing is created afresh, everything is transformed. Legal institutions form a kind of common treasure-store for humanity, from which we continually draw.”⁴

In one of his most striking chapters, Bernstein shows that it is the laws carried by capitalists under the present system which have given to the working-men the freedom and independence, the far-reaching outlook which have made modern Socialism possible. He instances especially

¹ *Essai sur la Propriété*, p. 1280.
Ibid p. 336.

² *Ibid*. pp. 289, 290.

⁴ *Ibid*. p. 337.

the Parliamentary vote and free education.¹ Like M. Tarbouriech, he recognizes that the temple of Socialism will be built (if it ever is to be built) out of stones hewn from remote quarries and borne down long and difficult streams.

The State, then, as Socialists admit, is to benefit by that great law which links the generations each to each. But they fail to recognize that every head of a family must naturally wish that his remoter, as well as his nearer, descendants should benefit by the material fruits of his labour. Through them his effort, his self-denial, his self-sacrifice, are treasured up for a life beyond life. He cannot be certain of bequeathing to his posterity anything but his reputation and his material possessions. Great qualities of heart and mind cannot be transmitted at will. "My sword I leave to him that shall succeed me in my pilgrimage," said Mr. Valiant: "my courage and skill to him that can get it."

II

Socialist Views on Inheritance

Socialists are determined, in the imagined interests of the community, to refuse entirely to the individual the free right to dispose of the goods he leaves behind him at death.² It is not some plan for graduated death duties on a higher scale than those of Sir William Harcourt which is contemplated, but the complete extinction, within a comparatively short period, of the property which each man hands on.

¹ *Die Voraussetzungen des Sozialismus*, p. 141.

² M. Jaurès argues at great length that this right is already taken away by the State, though not, as he acknowledges, in a manner of which Socialists could approve. We have already, he says, not the socialization of property, but the socialization of family duties and affections, since the State takes the father's place, and sees that the children are fairly treated in the division of his wealth.—*Études Socialistes*, p. 217.

Almost every recent foreign study of Socialism has a chapter on the right of inheritance. Dr. Menger says—

“The right of inheritance in our present social order is almost as important as the right of property, for while the latter decides the constitution of society in the present, the former decides it for the future. The entire wealth of the nation is, under our present organization of property, divided in overwhelming proportion among a certain number of individuals. . . . When these individuals are gradually removed by death from their circles of property ownership, the nation has an interest (surpassing almost every other question) in seeing that this enormous mass of goods, on which the economic existence of the whole people depends, shall be distributed to the coming generation with the right purpose in view.”¹

Dr. Menger argued that under a Socialist *régime* nothing should be left by will except “consumable property.” “The people’s Work-State,” he says, “must in any case put upon the right of inheritance a strongly democratic impress.” For example, (a) the larger estates should be diminished by heavy death duties; (b) an equal division should be made among the testator’s children; (c) only children, parents, and brothers and sisters ought to have any right to inherit. When these have died out, the State will take over the property.²

Dr. Menger adds: “By a far-reaching limitation of the right of inheritance in the democratic Work-State, one of the darkest shadows on our present legal system would unquestionably be removed. For no institution denies so entirely the connection between merit and reward, and none surrenders the course of human destinies so entirely to the chance of birth as this right of inheritance. . . . [Through this] the anomaly becomes possible that the grandson of Goethe should have lived in very humble circumstances, while the descendants of a lucky manufacturer

¹ *Neue Staatslehre*, p. 121.

² *Ibid.* pp. 122, 123. Dr. Menger no doubt meant to include husbands and wives, though he did not mention them expressly.

of boot-blackening, if they are sensible and economical, may enjoy for centuries a life free from work and care.”¹

English Socialist leaders approach the subject of inheritance somewhat more cautiously than the Viennese philosopher. Mr. Ramsay Macdonald says—

“Socialists do not object to property; they are not opposed to private property. They are not, therefore, opposed to inheritance. The right to acquire and hold involves the right to dispose by will or by gift. We only object to such a use of property as enables classes for generation after generation to live on the proceeds of other people’s labour without doing any useful service to society.”²

Mr. H. G. Wells remarks—

“Posthumous property, that is to say, the power to bequeath and the right to inherit things, will persist in a mitigated state under Socialism. There is no reason whatever why it should not do so. There is a strong natural sentiment in favour of the institution of heirlooms, for example: one feels a son might well own—though he should certainly not sell—the intimate things his father desires to leave him. . . . Even, perhaps, a proportion of accumulated money may reasonably go to friend or kin. It is a question of public utility.”³

Georges Renard, one of the most moderate of the French leaders, thinks that the socialization of property ought to begin by a reform of the law of inheritance. Like Mr. Macdonald and Mr. Wells, however, he would not abolish altogether the individual’s right to bequeath property.⁴

¹ *Neue Staatslehre*, pp. 123, 124.

² *New Worlds for Old*, pp. 145, 146.

³ *Socialism*, p. 105.

⁴ *Le Socialisme à l’Œuvre*, pp. 283, 284.

III

Rignano's Scheme of Inheritance

The ablest work which treats of inheritance from the Socialist standpoint is that of Eugenio Rignano.¹

Rignano agrees with one of the principal opponents of Socialism, M. Paul Leroy-Beaulieu, that repurchase, whether by the attempt to raise a gigantic national loan or by the State taking over property as a debt for which interest is to be paid, is a totally impracticable proposal. If the latter method could be adopted the State would gain nothing, for the net revenue from the land would be used up in paying rent to the former owners as indemnity. All schemes for gradual expropriation by taxing are rejected by Rignano as "illusory reform." "Unless we can touch inheritances," he says in effect, "there is no hope for Socialism save in a revolution by violence."

Rignano's general idea is that the nation should take over a certain proportion of each estate as it descends from generation to generation, so that after "a reasonable interval" what was once private property should become public property.

Suppose, for instance, that a father (A) leaves to his son the sum of £6,000, the State, by Rignano's project, will at once claim a third of the amount, leaving to the heir £4,000. The son (B) at his death leaves, let us say, £6,000, of which £2,000 has been added by his own

¹ *Un Socialismo in accordo colla dottrina economica liberale.* (Turin. 1901.) A French translation was published in 1904 by Messrs. Giard et Brière. Rignano's scheme has attracted the closest attention among foreign Socialists, and is discussed at length by M. Georges Renard in *Le Socialisme à l'Œuvre*. Rignano is a fervent and orthodox Socialist.

industry to the inherited money. This fortune is, under the scheme, divided into two portions. Of the amount which B has received from A (*i.e.* £4,000) the State takes away two-thirds, but takes only one-third of the amount which B has himself added to the paternal estate. In the third generation, at the death of A's grandson (C), a three-fold division will be made. All that now remains of the original property of A will be taken for the community. All that C has inherited from his father will be subject to a two-thirds death duty, while C's personal acquisitions will be mulcted at the rate of one-third.¹

Objections of many kinds have been raised by critics to Rignano's project, and M. Renard, with his usual ingenuity, invents replies.

(1) What is to be done, he asks, in the case of a person who has allowed his patrimony to decline? Answer: The remnant must obviously at his death suffer the fate of property transmitted for the second time.

(2) What shall be the decision in the case of a testator who, after inheriting a fortune, has lost it entirely or partially, and afterwards has regained the same amount, his fall and rise happening possibly two or three times over. Answer: No account need be taken of what has happened between the two transmissions. If a man who has inherited £6,000 leaves his son £8,000, it shall be assumed that the £6,000 originally inherited is included in the £8,000.

¹ Symbols clearly explaining the plan are given by Rignano on pp. 42, 43 of the French edition of his book (pp. 60, 61 of the Italian edition). The testator A leaves a sum represented by x . Of this the State, acting as co-heir, takes $\frac{2}{3}$, leaving B, the next heir, $\frac{1}{3}x$. B increases the patrimony $\frac{1}{3}x$ by acquisitions of his own, represented by y . At his death the State will take $\frac{2}{3}(\frac{1}{3}x) + \frac{2}{3}y$, leaving to C, the heir of B, $\frac{1}{3}(\frac{1}{3}x) + \frac{1}{3}y$. C adds to this an amount represented by z . At his death the property undergoes a threefold division. The State takes $\frac{2}{3}(\frac{1}{3}(\frac{1}{3}x) + \frac{1}{3}(\frac{1}{3}y) + \frac{1}{3}z)$. Thus in two generations the property of A is wiped out. The scheme is as simple as it is startling.

(3) Rignano recognizes that there are grave dangers inherent in any project for meddling with the individual's free right of disposing of his property, inherited or acquired. Men work, he admits, for their children as much as for themselves. Prevent them from leaving the main part of their fortune to their descendants in the next generation, and they will work a great deal less, or rather they will consume the product of their activity in their own lifetime—a course of action which would lead to terrible economic retrogression. The answer made to such objections by Socialists like Rignano and Renard is that a man's solicitude does not extend to all the generations that shall come after him. "He wishes to secure the well-being of his children, who are flesh of his flesh, and also that of his grandchildren. He wishes to know what will become of the goods he has possessed within the lifetime of those he has seen born": But how can he take any keen interest, these Socialists ask, in the fate of a posterity which he will never know, and in the uses to which his property will be put at a distant period into which his fancy cannot penetrate? Supporters of Rignano's scheme argue that under it men would work harder than ever, so as to leave their children in a position equal to their own.

Rignano's scheme, it should be noted, applies to small as well as large fortunes. He says: "The progressive principle would be applied to time rather than to space, and according to the age of the patrimonies rather than their amount."¹

"The right of leaving property by will," says Rignano, "is the true and only fundamental hindrance to that socialization of the instruments of production, and of capital in general, which, as we

¹ "Alla età dei patrimoni anzichè alla loro vastità."—*Op. cit.* p. 63.

THE QUESTION OF INHERITANCE 63

have seen, is the one means that remains for putting an end to the economic separation of the worker from his instruments of production.”¹

We may take it then as certain that the new Socialists, if they had the power, would abolish or profoundly modify the present system of inheritance.

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 21 (Italian edition), p. 18 (French edition).

CHAPTER VI

SOCIALISTS AND SMALL PROPERTY-OWNERS

APART from the question of inheritance, the new Socialism is sharply distinguished from the old in its attitude towards that great mass of the population in all countries who have a little to lose. Marx and Engels believed that they must be cruel to the small property-owner in order to be kind. His few acres of land, his small workshop or warehouse, must be swallowed up in the cataclysm, in order that he might become henceforth a free partner in the Socialist State. "The proletariat," said Lassalle, "is the rock on which the Church of the future will be built," and Marxian Socialism assumed, consciously or unconsciously, that its work would lie among the fierce, starving multitudes of great cities, "the ragged masses"¹ who hardly knew from day to day from what source they were to derive the means of subsistence. The earlier leaders viewed the man with a small balance in the bank with more scorn, if less hatred, than the owner of millions. They wished to draw into their net the little fishes as well as the whales. The peasant was to surrender his ancestral plot of ground, the small tradesman his stock, the master-craftsman his tools. Marx himself drew up the programme for the Congress of Havre in 1880, and demanded that all means of production, without any indulgence or favour, should be restored to a collectivist

¹ "Das Lumpenproletariat."

system. But even at this early date his chief followers showed a disposition to mutiny. Guesde and Lafargue were among the first "hard-shell" Socialists to recognize that some special consideration must be shown to the four million peasant proprietors of France, if ever the voting strength of these millions was to reinforce the Socialist army. They abandoned the Havre programme and courted the peasant vote. "The Socialist party," said they, "will not rob the peasant of his field; on the contrary, it will secure him in its possession." The Congress of Marseilles, held in 1892, voted for an agrarian programme founded on the maintenance of small holdings. The aged Engels was highly displeased with this action. "Small properties," he wrote, "must inevitably be ruined, destroyed by the development of capital. Those who wish to preserve small properties for more than a limited period have sacrificed the principle of Socialism and become reactionaries." Bebel wrote that "if the peasant puts forth the claim to remain a proprietor, he had better join the camp of the anti-Semites." These utterances of twenty-five years ago are echoed in a saying of Mr. Blatchford: "Under Socialism no citizen would be allowed to call a single inch of land his own. All the land would belong to the people, and would be used by the people, for the best advantage of the people."¹

Almost the only influential foreign leader who now in part defends this position is Karl Kautsky, and as we see from his well-known work on the agrarian question,² his

¹ *The Sorcery Shop*, p. 176. English Socialists of to-day oppose the idea of a peasant-ownership of the land, but are willing that small allotments should be held by individuals under public bodies.

² *Die Agrarfrage*. (Stuttgart. 1899.) Two other German books, each taking a different view from Kautsky's, may be recommended to the student. One is Dr. Eduard David's *Sozialismus und Landwirtschaft* (Berlin. Verlag der sozialistischen Monatshefte. 1903). The other is Friedrich Otto Hertz's work, *Die agrarischen Fragen im Verhältniss zum Sozialismus* (Vienna, L. Rosner. 1899).

views have undergone considerable modification since the Breslau meeting of 1895.

Kautsky maintains that small owners, whether peasant proprietors or the heads of little businesses or industries, are in process of being ruined by the large capitalists, and support themselves, as it is, only by excessive toil and severe privation. He notes, also, that many trades which seem to flourish are really parasitic trades, dependent on the caprices of the wealthy, and destined to disappear with the expropriation of capital. He says to the peasant in effect: "Your small holding will ultimately be swallowed up, not because we Socialists mean to rob you of it, but because there is a great law which works towards the concentration of land and industries. When the day of change arrives, we Socialists alone can secure your future."

Even Kautsky, as we see, hesitates to terrify the peasant with the red spectre. "If we take his acres into collective possession," he says further, "we shall leave his little home intact."

"Modern Socialism," writes Kautsky, "rests on common property in the means of production, not in the means of enjoyment. For the latter, private ownership is not excluded. Among the means of enjoying and feeling a cheerful satisfaction in human life, one of the most important, perhaps the most important, is the separate home. Common property in land and soil is in no way incompatible with this.¹ . . . The peasant need not be frightened about his home. The Socialist Government will not pass by his door, leaving no trace of its presence, but the hygienic and æsthetic changes it brings will not turn out to be for the disadvantage of the peasant home."²

Since Kautsky, the most honest of Socialists, dares not promise that the peasant shall retain the independent right

¹ *Die Agrarfrage*, p. 447.

² *Ibid.* p. 451.

to his holding, he comforts him with the prospect of a time when all household duties shall be performed on a collectivist plan, and when his wife shall no longer be compelled to do her own cooking and washing. It is important to notice that even Kautsky feels himself obliged to moderate the old Marxian policy as far as possible, when he remembers that Germany has over three million peasant owners.

I

The New Socialists and Peasant Proprietors

The peasantry, as Dr. John Rae observes, have always been objects of peculiar interest to Socialists, "because it is a maxim among old revolutionary hands that without the co-operation of the peasantry, no revolution can be successful." Anti-Socialist teachers on the Continent have always threatened the peasant with spoliation if he accepted the doctrines of Marx and his followers. They have told him that he would be driven from his field and his cottage and sent to wander on the high-road with his children like that tragic figure, Jean Louarn, in René Bazin's novel, *Donatienne*. The latest Socialist policy in all Continental countries is to deny any intention to expropriate the peasantry. In proof of this we may quote a few passages.

Georges Renard says—

"Let us proclaim aloud that we do not wish to take anything from that poor man, who has not his proper rights under the present system ; we will not drive him from his humble home ; he shall keep the soil of his fathers for himself and his sons."¹

M. Jaurès, though he has wavered from time to time on

¹ *Le Socialisme à l'Œuvre*, p. 226.

this question, would agree in general with the maxim: "Do not frighten the peasants."

"Small proprietors," he says, "would not be in the least alarmed by this gradual transformation, which would not threaten them and which would be clothed in legal form. They would soon link themselves by voluntary ties to the great centre of action formed by communal or co-operative property."¹

A few pages further on he remarks—

"Socialists have certainly never thought of causing peasant property to be forcibly drawn into the Communist framework."

M. Jaurès expressed his sincerest thought when he wrote, "Property holds democrats by every fibre," and among democrats he must have included Socialists. In a poetical chapter he pictures the lot of the vine-dressers under collectivist administration—

"They will be attached to the great vineyard which their hands cultivate, by a stronger and more vital bond, a fuller and more gladdening consciousness, than the wage-earner is to-day. And yet it is very probable that they would feel it as a loss and a diminution of their life-power if they could no longer, as they watched the grapes ripening on a few stocks which belonged to themselves alone, experience that secret joy in which there is more inner satisfaction than selfishness."²

Turning to Germany, we find an increasing determination among the most thoughtful Socialists that the men who work their own fields with their own hands must not be despoiled of their possessions. The peasant's horse, cow, and plot of ground are not to be socialized, if only because it is recognized that he would fight as hard for them as the great landlord for his estates. The Congress of Frankfort in 1894 appointed a committee to prepare

¹ *Études Socialistes*, p. 9.

² *Ibid.* p. 19.

an agrarian programme for the party, and this committee decided that while large estates must be nationalized, the peasant should be left in possession of his property. It is true that this proposal, which had the support of Bebel, was rejected at the Breslau Congress in the following year by a vote of three to one. Kautsky led the opposition to Bebel at Breslau, but Kautsky himself repudiates all violent procedure. That famous "scarlet thread" which, as he says, runs through his writings, is the conviction that all small concerns, agricultural and industrial, are given over to destruction by an inevitable process.

Dr. Eduard David, at the close of his long and learned work on "Socialism and Agriculture," sums up his arguments as follows: "We do not hesitate to put forward the policy of transforming large agricultural concerns into small peasant-owned properties as a goal well worth aiming at." ¹

The protection of the peasant, according to Dr. David, "means the protection and furthering of the more modern and more rational form of industry." He believes that the solution of agrarian difficulties will be found in the formation of co-operative, highly-organized unions of small properties, which will be able to protect the food of the people from the encroachments of capitalistic exploiters and middlemen.

Notwithstanding Dr. David's hopeful arguments, it is difficult to see how small proprietorships could continue on the land under Socialism. Who would do the work of the farm? How could there be two classes of labourers in the country, one enjoying the benefits of Socialism, the other employed by individual masters? The rate of wages and the hours of work would be fixed by the State, and by

¹ *Sozialismus und Landwirtschaft*, p. 699.

the State alone, at a fixed tariff, could the peasant farmer sell his butter, eggs and fowls. The conditions would become so intolerable that he would surely either revolt or demand the socialization of his land.¹

The question of peasant proprietorship presents itself in our own country under a special aspect. In France and Germany, Socialists are asking with Werner Sombart: "Ought we so to modify the principles of Collectivism as to retain the peasant on the soil which his family may have held for generations?" In England, Socialists of the Fabian school are eagerly joining in plans for getting the peasant back to the land, but as a tenant rather than an owner. In a Fabian essay on "The Revival of Agriculture,"² we find the following passage—

"Give him (the labourer) a decent wage, decent food, a decent house, security from the interference of squire, farmer, and parson in his private affairs, and, above all, a real chance of bettering himself, and we shall see a new type of agricultural worker. There is something in the 'magic of property,' above all, of property in oneself."

II

The Small Shopkeeper and Manufacturer

The dread of alienating large masses of voters is perceptible in recent Socialist writings which touch on other classes of small property-holders besides the peasant proprietor. In an article in the *Clarion*,³ Mr. R. B. Suthers says—

"A Socialist Government would naturally not desire to impoverish the poor man who happened to be a little capitalist.

¹ See on this point Mermeix's argument in *Le Socialisme*, pp. 265, 266.

² *Socialism and Agriculture*. Fabian Socialist Series, No. 2. (A. C. Fifield. 1908.

³ January 24, 1908.

The Duke of Westminster and John Smith might conceivably have, the first, one million, and the second £20 in the same land company. Well, if the land company were nationalized and the dividends were reduced to a fixed rate of interest, it might hurt John Smith, while the Duke of Westminster would not feel the reduction. Such a reduction would be provided for. John Smith might have his tobacco and food taxes and his rates reduced, so that he would not lose on the whole. The working man with £20 in the bank, or a house of his own, need have no fear."

We quote this passage as a proof that English as well as foreign Socialists realize that the greatest danger to their cause comes from the side of the small owner. He must be conciliated, flattered, lured with promises, otherwise he will instinctively take sides with large owners. Socialists are now proclaiming that the real danger to Society comes not from the producers who possess their own means of production, but from non-producers who are exploiting other people's.¹ Many small businesses, they suggest, will continue, provisionally at least, under Socialism. The doctrinal rigour of the creed gives way before the statistics which prove that property-owners, in France, for instance, are the majority of the population.² Renard gives some instructive figures on this point. In 1903, he says, there was a total of 753,606 deaths among the population of France, of whom 197,777 were of persons under twenty. Deducting these from the whole, there remain 555,829, and of these persons no fewer than 386,032 left property, though 121,558 of the total left sums not exceeding £20. It may be safely claimed that the owner of £20, no less than the owner of £20,000 or £20,000,000, will stand firm in the defence of his rights against Socialist pleadings.

¹ See the chapter entitled "On the policy which Socialism ought to pursue towards small property" in *Le Socialisme à l'Œuvre*, p. 118.

² *Ibid.* pp. 274, 275.

In sparing the small properties, Socialists would surrender, as Engels saw, a vital principle of their creed. If the peasants are to flourish, singly or in co-operative unions, if the little tradesman and the master mechanic may carry on their business undisturbed, if the working-man may accumulate his savings, either privately or through his benefit societies, where is the need of a social revolution? Withdraw the "scarlet thread" from the fabric, and there lies before us only the plain grey stuff of social reform, the urgent need for a betterment of the condition of the poorest.

CHAPTER VII

PRACTICAL WORKING OF THE SOCIALIST STATE

AFTER the death of Liebknecht, his executors found amongst his papers an unfinished manuscript, begun eleven years earlier,¹ in which he attempted to answer the great question which continually occupied his mind: How will Socialism realize itself in practice? The question for Liebknecht and his circle, even in hours of deepest political depression, was not *whether*, but *how*? The German leader used to say that comrades often asked him if he thought they would live to see the triumph of the cause. "*Donec optata veniat dies*,"² was the guiding thought of all their action. They were "up every morning by break of day, tracing and walking to and fro in the valley"; and at rare moments, like the pilgrims on the Delectable Mountains, they saw through a glass the gate of the Socialist city, "and also some of the glory of the place." During recent years it has been possible to distinguish several clearly defined schools of constructive Socialist thinkers, and to these we must devote a few paragraphs.

I

Divergent Views on Constructive Socialism

(a) The first are the cautious and hesitating thinkers who resent close questioning.

¹ Liebknecht died in August 1900. This fragment was published in *Vorwärts* on the first anniversary of his death

² "Till the wished-for day shall come."

We take two examples of their mode of argument—

The great Italian Reformist, Signor Turati, writing in the *Critica Sociale*, says—

“Let the men of the future think out the plans of the future Social State, which for the most part it is impossible to foresee. We shall be satisfied with having recognized the great guiding line of evolution and the granite foundations of the war of classes.”

Mr. R. B. Suthers, writing in the *Clarion*,¹ says—

“Why is it impossible to produce a cut and dried plan? Simply because comprehensive prophecy of the future is beyond human power. . . . It would be a silly waste of time for any Socialist to spend his life in drawing up cut and dried plans of a distant future.”

Writers like Mr. Suthers consider themselves as members of an Opposition who may ere long be summoned to form a Cabinet. All that the country can reasonably expect of them, it is argued, is a broad outline of principles. Thinkers of this class, when they compare their own policy with that of the “outs” towards the “ins” in our ordinary party warfare, forget that, as Bernstein says, Socialism “aims at creating entirely new things.”

(b) The second class are the pure idealists who look at Socialism through the astronomer’s glass.

One of the most characteristic thinkers of this school is that brilliant Italian, Arturo Labriola. In the *Revue Socialiste*² he entered the lists in opposition to Bernstein.

“To plant Socialism on the soil of our present society,” he wrote, “would be to deprive it of that halo of illusion and mystery which accounts for the marvellous force of passion which it exercises in our day.”

¹ March 27, 1908.

² Vol. xxix, p. 679.

But he indignantly repudiated, in another article, the idea that Socialists should not be ready, at all times and in all places, to describe the visions which they saw on the far horizon. He protested

“against the dangerous fashion (the result of an extreme intellectual indolence), a fashion which is not authorized by the example of any of the great Socialist writers, above all of Marx and Engels, of refusing to give any information as to the positive programme of Socialism.” . . . “It is not permissible to get off under the pretext that the Socialist’s business is not that of the prophet. The Socialist party must know what it is aiming at.”¹

Another writer who belongs to the idealistic type is Saverio Merlino, and a third is our own Robert Blatchford, as readers of *The Sorcery Shop* can testify. Merlino argues that the events of history are working on the side of Socialism.²

“If for ten or twenty years not a single Socialist book or newspaper were published; if governments were to suppress, as they sometimes dream of doing, all manifestations of the Socialist idea—even then Socialism would not be dead. Every quarrel between masters and men, every attempt at co-operation, every conflict of class-interest, every reform of public administration, would recall men’s thoughts to that new conception of social relationships which goes by the name of Socialism.”

After referring to the influence that would be exercised by the question of unemployment, by strikes, by the continual drain of national strength caused by emigration, by sudden outbursts of insurrection, and by money panics, in keeping Socialism alive in the most anti-Socialist State, Merlino adds—

¹ Arturo Labriola is now one of the most active leaders of the school of Revolutionary Syndicalism. The passages we have quoted above were written some years ago.

² *Formes et Essence du Socialisme*, Ch. 1.

"*The Socialism of Socialists* is only a pale reflection, a mere derivative, of the *Socialism of things*."¹

These Italian watchers of the skies imagine that they see much further into the night than their comrades born in mistier lands, but it is difficult to glean from their writings a clear answer to the questions which puzzle the average impartial student.

(c) To the third class of constructive Socialists belong the great majority of English and foreign writers of the past decade. They are ready with a clear answer on a thousand practical details, and by comparing their statements carefully we can form an idea of the Socialist State as they conceive it. Their telescope is like the familiar instrument on the balcony of Swiss hotels. If new planets do not swim into our ken as we use it, at least we can trace the laborious progress of climbers on a neighbouring peak.

II

First Principles of Constructive Socialism

At the outset these writers postulate two fundamental principles: (1) All must work (and as a corollary, all have a right to work). (2) Class distinctions must be abolished. The Socialist State, in Dr. Menger's constantly reiterated phrase, is to be "a democratic Work-State." Monopolies are to be suppressed, usury is to disappear, there is to be no more exploitation of men by men. From the rule of universal labour certain classes only will be exempted—the physically and mentally infirm, the aged and the children. A close examination of the international writings of Socialists brings out the fact that St. Paul's maxim is accepted universally amongst them: "We that are strong

¹ *Formes et Essence du Socialisme*, p. 4.

ought to bear the infirmities of the weak." We have not found a single passage which even hints that Socialists, in the day of triumph, would leave the wounded on the field. The doctrine of the survival of the fittest, of the reign of the physical and intellectual superman, must be sought elsewhere than in Socialist literature. The severest critics of Socialism must admit that it has certain noble aspects, especially (1) in the honour it puts on labour, (2) in the lofty motives it sets before the worker,¹ and (3) in the shield it throws over the weak things of the world.

III

General Framework of the Socialist State

We proceed next to consider the general framework of the Socialist State.

1. *The Monarchy*.—The question of monarchy *versus* republic was much discussed by the earlier Socialist thinkers. For the newer writers the subject has somewhat lost interest. A careful discussion is that of Anton Menger. In his view the Latin races, who have a genius for revolution, will ultimately organize themselves as Socialist republics, while the Germanic peoples, who move more cautiously, may effect a compromise with their reigning houses, which will leave to the monarch at least a semblance of rule.

"In England," writes Menger, "there has been for more than two hundred years no attempt at a *coup d'état*. The farthest-reaching popular wishes have been satisfied by legislation. The Continental military and police oppression is there practically unknown. The Briton may claim with justifiable pride that in

¹ Signor Chiappelli, in his book, *Il Socialismo e il pensiero moderno*, claims that the motive principle of the new Socialism is the "hunger and thirst for social justice."

his country obedience to the law is not only demanded from the lower classes, but is practised by the most powerful, and that the personal freedom of the masses cannot be disturbed in order to further courtly and aristocratic interests. Hence it is probable that the social question in England will be settled by a slow development, under legal and administrative forms, and that the monarchy will be preserved.”¹

In Germany, also, Dr. Menger thinks the working classes will prefer to maintain monarchical government.

Georges Renard, on the other hand, discusses in a grudging tone the position of the French President under a possible Socialist constitution.

“The most important function of the President of the Republic is that which makes him the nation’s representative in dealing with foreign Powers; but if he is only to play an ornamental part, to take the place of the monarch at ceremonies, then the Socialist democracy, which thinks little of ceremonial, will not consider this a sufficient reason for the maintenance of so important a magistracy. If, on the other hand, he is to take a preponderating share in the direction of diplomatic affairs, to arrange and conclude treaties which bind the nation, without consulting or even warning the national representatives, then the Presidency of the Republic is not only useless, but dangerous in the highest degree.”²

International Socialists have come to no unanimous decision as to the retention of King or President in their imagined State, but all would agree that if such a Head were tolerated, his power must be reduced to the lowest limits and his functions restricted to necessary ceremonial tasks. All forms of Cæsarism are hateful to Socialists.

2. *Universal Suffrage*.—The new Socialists, like their predecessors, desire that the working classes in all countries shall conquer for themselves supreme political power, therefore they advocate a universal suffrage, from which

¹ *Neue Staatslehre*, pp. 173, 174.

² *Le Socialisme à l'Œuvre*, p. 337.

none save minors and the mentally incompetent shall be excluded. The question of the suffrage for women is discussed by many Socialist writers, though others significantly avoid it. The general drift of opinion within the party strongly favours a female franchise. Georges Renard says: "Against the principle of universal suffrage, including the admission of women to the vote, no serious objection can be raised, and Socialists ought to demand and obtain it.¹ Renard, however, wishes the change to come about gradually, and recommends that women should receive a gradual preparation for the fullest political rights. He dreads the influence of the clergy upon women, especially in Roman Catholic countries, and thinks that the whole force of the female vote might be thrown for a time on the side of reaction. Dr. Menger, on the other hand, insists on the complete and immediate political enfranchisement of women.

3. *Parliamentary Rule*.—In discussing the Parliamentary and judicial changes that might be desirable in a democratic Work-State, the best class of Socialists write with extreme caution. A typical passage is the following from Merlino—

"Our political, like our economic, organization is the result of a long development, and could not be radically transformed at short notice. . . . It would be absurd to deny that the present political system is greatly preferable to the older forms of government—feudal, monarchical, absolute, theocratic, etc. Not the central government only, but the different branches of State administration are better organized to-day than ever. The legislation of a representative chamber, however bad it may be, is always preferable to the will of a despot."²

Our judicial system may not be ideally perfect, but who

¹ *Le Socialisme à l'Œuvre*, pp. 306, 307.

² *Formes et Essence du Socialisme*, pp. 106, 107.

would wish to substitute for it the rule of the Cadi under the palm-tree, or of the elders in the Gate, or any form of mob-law?

Dr. Menger and M. Renard approve of a bi-cameral system. The former thinks that a second chamber would be necessary in order to prevent the over-hasty legislation to which the new democracy would be constantly tempted. "Over-haste," he adds, "would be doubly dangerous in the democratic Work-State, because the legislature would concern itself chiefly with social rather than political tasks. Historical experience proves that the greatest transformations of political power can very easily be reversed, but that social transformations remain almost always irrevocable facts."

Socialist writers of Georges Renard's school are fully awake to this danger, and feel that some check on popular caprice must remain in the Socialist Constitution. As a counter-check, Renard proposes the regular use of the *Referendum*, so that the people may constantly renew their mandate to their representatives in Parliament.

4. *The Official Class*.—All Socialists desire to lighten the labours of the central governing body by an elaborate system of decentralization. Their sanest thinkers do not deny that the Work-State will have to support an immense army of officials. Dr. Menger thinks that this army will fall into two main bodies, called respectively "the Boards of Public Order" and "the Economic Boards." Mr. Bruce Glasier, writing in the *Labour Leader*¹ on "The Plague of Officials," estimates that we have at present some two million "officials of industry," and promises that Socialism will reduce their numbers. But would not any reduction in one sphere be more than counterbalanced by

¹ December 20, 1907.

increase in another? As we consider the immense variety of functions which the State is to take over by the mere fact of its becoming the universal producer and distributor, we half suspect that under Socialism a considerable proportion of the people might live by "taking in each other's washing"—in other words, by looking after each other's welfare in an official capacity.

Would all the citizens be eligible for official posts? Would there be freedom in choosing one's life-work? This is the important question to which we shall next address ourselves.

CHAPTER VIII

THE COMMANDEERING OF LIVES UNDER SOCIALISM

"SOCIALISM," said Ledru-Rollin, in 1848, "means that the State shall take the place of individual freedom and shall become the most frightful of tyrants."

If we seek among the utterances of Socialists of the last generation for a statement which would justify such language, we may find it, perhaps, in a famous saying of Karl Pearson: "Socialists have to inculcate that spirit which would give offenders against the State short shrift and the nearest lamp-post. Every citizen must learn to say with Louis XIV, '*L'État c'est moi.*'" ¹

Do the Socialists of to-day accept the teaching of Pearson? The question can be answered only after a very careful examination of their international literature. Their wisest minds, as the impartial inquirer must admit, are deeply exercised by the problem of the reconciliation of personal freedom with complete State control.

I

Opposing views of Socialists on this Question

1. Some of the ablest Socialist writers recognize the danger of a Socialist tyranny.

Karl Kautsky, in his book on the Erfurt programme,

¹ *Ethic of Free Thought*, p. 324.

has a very interesting chapter on "Socialism and Freedom."¹ He acknowledges that there is a class of Socialists—the so-called Anarchists—who dread the possible slavery that would be the lot of all men under a Collectivist State. He is answering comrades as well as opponents when he tries to show that the well-fed, well-clothed, comfortably-housed Socialist citizen would not be a serf at the call of his master, the State. "Our opponents," says Kautsky, "compare the lot of the individual under Socialist rule to that of the caged bird."

"The bird in the cage may depend on having a sufficient supply of daily seed; he is secured from hunger, storm and foes. But he has no freedom, and therefore he is a pitiable creature, who longs to fly out into the world of dangers and necessity, out into the struggle for existence."²

There is something pathetic in Kautsky's refutation of this argument, because he misses the essential point.

"It is true enough," he says, "that Socialistic production is incompatible with full freedom of work; *i. e.* with the freedom of the labourer to work where, when, and as he wills. But this freedom of the workman is impossible under *any* organized association of labourers, whether founded on capitalistic or collectivist principles."³

He argues that under the present system neither hand nor brain workers are free to choose their duties. Doctors, school-masters, railway officials, journalists, must keep their hours, must appear at the allotted place to carry out the allotted task.⁴ He admits that the worker of to-day has a distinct advantage over the citizen of the imagined

¹ *Das Erfurter Programm*, pp. 166-176.

We need not apologize for referring readers often to the works of Kautsky. He is a Socialist "of the old rock," and at the same time he is fully alive to the changing conditions of the age. There is a frank honesty in all his books which appeals to impartial minds. He is the true intellectual heir of Marx.

² *Ibid.* p. 166.

³ *Ibid.* p. 167.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 168.

Socialist State in that he can, in most cases, transfer his services from one master to another. Under Socialism we should all be either loyal, unquestioning servants of our sole master, the State, or rebels who deserve starvation, exile, "the nearest lamp-post."

Kautsky shows how the growing mass of unemployment makes it difficult for the worker who is thrown out to choose another master. "The number of vacant posts is far smaller than the number of candidates. The man who is out of work must think himself lucky, as a rule, if he can find any position."

It is strange that so able a writer should fail to recognize that the real difficulty for the impartial student is how to reconcile individual freedom with the inexorable necessity that the State should provide a sufficient service (but no more) for every calling. Demand and supply, in material things, would be strictly regulated by the Socialist bureaucracy, and the same rule would inevitably hold good with lives.

It is not the middle-aged "out-of-work" who would feel the full pressure of the autocracy, but the young man whose career was chosen for him, as far as possible with deference to his aptitudes and inclinations, but in the last resort with a view to State necessities.

Kautsky's message to the working-man may be summed up as follows: (a) You are not a free agent now, and we cannot promise that you will be one under the Socialist State. But you will find many advantages in exchanging the rule of the private capitalist for that of the community. (b) The true goal is not *freedom to work*, but *deliverance from work as far as work means wearing drudgery*.

Dr. Menger has a serious passage on the risks of Socialist interference with individual liberty. After opposing the

view of German Conservative statesmen that Socialism would involve a barrack discipline for everybody, with the alternative of the house of correction, he says—

“We should be wrong, however, if we rejected entirely the idea which lies at the basis of these objections. While it is certain that for the community as a whole the lessening of economic freedom is not necessarily bound up with the democratic work-State, the danger does undoubtedly exist that this form of government should misuse its great economic powers for the enslavement of the individual, as the present individualistic power-State misuses its political supremacy.”¹

The utmost caution, the strictest self-control, would be necessary, in Dr. Menger's opinion, on the part of a Socialist Government, in order to avert this danger. Public advantages, he says, must be sacrificed rather than that personal freedom should be infringed. Only in cases of the utmost importance must the State demand enforced service from its citizens.² “Otherwise there is reason to fear that the democratic work-State would quickly comprise the most powerful elements of an individualistic tendency, just as in our own time the encroachments of individualism have become the chief motive force in the development of Socialism.”³

Mr. H. G. Wells says—

“Let us be frank ; a form of Socialism might conceivably exist without much freedom, with hardly more freedom than that of a British worker to-day. A State Socialism tyrannized over by officials who might be almost as bad at times as uncontrolled small employers, is so far possible that in Germany it is practically half-existent now. A bureaucratic Socialism might conceivably be a state of affairs scarcely less detestable than our own.”⁴

¹ *Neue Staatslehre*, p. 63.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *New Worlds for Old*, p. 208.

2. Other Socialists, while admitting that their ideal State must be an autocracy, declare that the individual has nothing to fear. One of these is Georges Renard.

"Socialism grants to the individual an inviolable domain," says M. Renard, "round which it will raise, rather than overthrow, sacred barriers. . . . Everything that belongs to private life, to opinion, to conscience, must be protected from all attacks, [for these things lie] without and above all reasons of State. In the full liberty of associations, and amongst them of the Churches, in freedom to meet in public, to speak and to write, Socialism sees no annoying derogation of its authoritative principle, but the very *raison d'être* and the most desirable result of the authority it wishes to establish."¹

The honeyed words of M. Renard may have sweetened the hard morsel of Socialism for many a French working-man. But he represents, on this question, only the most optimistic section of his party, and, as we shall see, he makes provision, in another book, against the very dangers to the individual which the late Dr. Menger dreaded.

3. There are Socialists among the moderns who would accept the full teaching of Karl Pearson. We may take as an example M. Deslinières, who, in his book on the Application of the Collectivist System, lays down a series of urgent provisional laws for the Socialist commonwealth. They include the following—

(a) The granting of arms to the executive government for the prevention of all disorder from the beginning. This right is to be used with extreme moderation.

(b) The suspension of the liberty of the press and of public meeting at the will of the government.

(c) The restoration to the government of the right of appointing municipal bodies.

(d) All men of full age who have not yet reached the age or retirement are to be required to work in the public service, in return for a fair salary.

(e) For those who refuse, the punishment will be confiscation of

all income above the wage of a journeyman of the third class; for those with a smaller income, enrolment among the pensionaries of the social poor law.

(f) Any one who, without permission from the government, lives more than three months abroad is to lose his national rights and his property.¹

II

Would Individual Freedom be Possible under a Socialist State?

We proceed next to inquire (1) what would be the conditions of life under a Socialist State which, in the view of Socialists themselves, might restrict personal freedom, and (2) how Socialists propose to meet the difficulty.

Socialism, by its basic principles, guarantees to every citizen equality of opportunity. Its teachers agree that while men can never be intellectually equal, the State can at least provide for each the same chance at the beginning, the same fair start in life.

The doctrine of equality of opportunity is one of the root-principles of Liberal as well as Socialist policy, and has been expounded with great ability by Mr. Asquith. But while Liberals believe that the necessary changes must come gradually and by a process of evolution, the Socialist State would from the beginning impose equal obligations upon every citizen. Unless human nature were to undergo that radical and inexplicable change which seems to be a primary condition of any Socialist success, men would want to choose their work according to their own capacities and inclinations, not to be driven to work at whatever occupation the State might select for them. "Quite so," reply

¹ *L'Application du Système Collectiviste*, pp. 469-471. Chapter entitled "Lois urgentes provisoires." (Paris, 1899. Librairie de la Revue Socialiste.)

the Socialists; "we intend as far as possible to make provision for the fullest and freest use of natural gifts and tastes.¹ At our primary schools children will be carefully examined for the purpose of ascertaining how they can best serve the community. The boy with a gift for drawing will have his chance of going into an architect's office, the lad who excels in study will be marked out for one of the learned professions." In this connection it should be noted that Socialists are preparing for a very heavy educational budget, and we can understand how vast an army of officials will be required for this analysis of youthful capacity in the schools.

The same freedom for all in theory, but in practice only such freedom as is consistent with the fulfilment of the disagreeable as well as the pleasanter tasks of the world—this would be the utmost that Socialism could give.

M. Renard, in his attractive and ingenious book, *Le Régime Socialiste*, goes into this question of the division of work under the Socialist State, with special reference to the supply of labour for the difficult, dangerous, and unsavoury occupations.

Who, for instance, would choose the miner's perilous calling and consent to hazard his life, year in, year out, in the depths of the earth, if he could secure a livelihood instead as a small official of the State Mining Board? Who would be a sewer-man, or a scavenger, if the chance were open to him (with equal opportunities, be it remembered, in early education) of becoming a desk-worker in some London office? Would not officialism generally, and all the easy, sunshiny occupations, attract a horde of applicants,

¹ M. Deslinières, it must in fairness be said, proposed to include among his urgent measures a rule providing that every citizen should labour at his own profession, business, etc., or in some other of a similar character.

while the most arduous and unhealthy trades would be entirely neglected?

M. Renard, after admitting that the opponents of Socialism have here touched upon a great and real difficulty, seeks to solve it as follows—

(a) Men have varying tastes and inclinations. Danger itself is attractive to some dispositions. The severest muscular strain would to some people be more welcome than any mental exertion. Therefore the supposed inequality might not be so great as some imagine.

(b) By the invention of labour-saving machinery, and new contrivances of all sorts, the most perilous employments would in course of time be made comparatively safe and easy.

(c) Men who accept unattractive employments should receive higher remuneration than others. M. Renard proposes an automatic balance-system, under which, in proportion as any trade becomes overcrowded, those employed in it will be made to work shorter hours, and in consequence, to receive less payment than the workers in the less desirable occupations. Other Socialists, again, would give equal payment to all, but would allow the scavenger and the sewer-man, the chimney-sweep and the slater, to earn their living by a shorter daily output of labour than is expected from the average worker.

For the learned professions the standard of acquirements would be raised in such a way as to keep out all but the best men.¹

Mermeix, in his impartial examination of Socialism,² quotes with great delight that passage in William Morris's

¹ We have summarized these proposals from *Le Régime Socialiste*, pp. 145-147. Sixth edition, 1907. (Félix Alcan. Paris.)

² *Le Socialisme*, p. 270.

News from Nowhere, in which the diners in the Guest House see "a splendid figure slowly sauntering over the pavement; a man whose surcoat was embroidered most copiously as well as elegantly, so that the sun flashed back from him as if he had been clad in golden armour."¹ This magnificent figure, the Socialist Mr. Boffin (his real name is Henry Johnson), is the "Golden Dustman" to his comrades. In work-life he is only "*le ramasseur d'ordures, le boueux*," but he is called Boffin as a joke, "partly because he is a dustman, and partly because he will dress so showily, and get as much gold on him as a baron of the Middle Ages. As why should he not if he likes?"

This is very pleasing, and the new Socialists revel in the idea of the work-task and the leisure-task for every individual. Mr. Blatchford, in *The Sorcery Shop*, introduces us to a company of navvies at their task of cutting.² These handsome, muscular fellows wear the traditional moleskin trousers and blue or grey shirts, with collars open at the throat. They wash their hands before the midday meal, they discuss a new translation of the *Odyssey* and a psychological problem. They are presented to us as ideal citizens of the Socialist State. Yet, amidst their apparent happiness and freedom, we feel that the iron fetters bind them at wrists and ankles. The Socialist State, considered as an employer of labour, appears to the impartial student like a mediæval war-lord, whose full panoply of mail is concealed beneath robes of flowing velvet. He desires to reign despotically over a willing and obedient people, but he means to set his iron heel on the neck of every rebel.

Statements like those of M. Deslinières and Karl Pear-

¹ *News from Nowhere*. Tenth edition, 1908. (Longmans.)

² *The Sorcery Shop*, pp. 136-146.

THE COMMANDEERING OF LIVES 9

son are out of fashion with the majority of Socialists to-day. But if the words are obsolete, ~~the idea survives~~. M. Deslinières himself has an eloquent passage on prison reform, in which he maintains that our gaols should be transformed into agreeable country residences. The criminal is to be allowed to dress and eat as he chooses, to read the newspapers, to smoke, and receive daily visits from his friends without the presence of a warder.¹ The comforts of the new prison system, there is reason to suppose, would be reserved for offenders against the ordinary code of morals, not for rebels against the State. The Socialist State could not afford to tolerate rebels.²

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 191.

² It is surprising to find how very few of the newer Socialist writers even touch upon the question of the treatment of rebels against the State. Nearly all assume that under such blissful rule there would be no rebellion.

CHAPTER IX

THE REWARDS OF LABOUR UNDER SOCIALISM

For the student of Socialism there is no more attractive occupation than that of tracing, in the earlier and later international literature, the changing views of the great thinkers on the question of equality under the Socialist State. As Shakespeare endowed some of his favourite characters with an idealism which he was far from sharing, so a large class of Socialist leaders legislate, perhaps unknowingly, for a perfected human race, freed from all the wretchednesses and trammels of mortality. Among the earlier

In the history of Socialism it should be noted, the doctrine of an equality of Mrs. As was not universal. The followers of Saint Simon and Fourier were prepared for a hierarchical organization of society. But it has been a theory of many later writers that equal payments to every worker would be the only fair system under a Socialist State. Karl Marx, in *Capital*, assumed equal wages as a necessary corollary for the "dogma" of human equality. A doctor, for example, is to give his nights and days to the relief of suffering, without material or moral recognition beyond that which the sewer-man receives for his short hours of toil. William Morris, with a want of perspicacity singular enough in such a genius, imagined that the liberty to wear fine clothes would exercise some extraordinarily stimulating influence. There is no Socialist to-day (not even Morris's spiritual son, Robert Blatchford) who would fill space by

describing men's waist-belts of damascened steel and filigree silver-work, as if solete, the ~~instruments~~ could be fetters binding hearts to the new ~~passage~~ passage on prison 'alism is dead everywhere, and the twentieth ~~'s~~ should be ~~is~~ are facing real and earnest problems.

I

Views of English Socialists on the Equality of Rewards.

1. *Opinions in Favour of Equality.*—Mr. Blatchford, in *The Sorcery Shop*, goes into this question carefully. His wizard engages the visitors in a series of Socratic discussions.

"You really believe," says the wizard, "that a man possessed of the genius to invent a much-needed machine, or to ~~It much-needed work, can only be induced to act by the hope of, give~~ reward."

"I believe," said Mr. Jorkle, "that a man w^{ill} try ^{ex soci} for money than for anything else."

"But you admit that genius can and does work w^{ith} list cit^{ation} of gain."

"Oh—sometimes."

"Sometimes. And you admit that greed can accomplish nothing without genius."

"That is not the argument."

"That is part of the argument. For it seems to show that genius is stronger than greed, and that genius is not dependent upon greed for its impulse to action."¹

The subject is resumed later on, and the wizard is asked—

"But you propose that all men should be on a level. You would pay the doctor no more than the docker. Do you expect that to result in anything but deterioration?"

"I expect it to work, as it does work now, the whole world over, successfully," answers the wizard.²

¹ *The Sorcery Shop*, pp. 109, 110.

Ibid. p. 116.

A few pages further on the wizard says to the General—

"You suggest that we should pay the superior person superior wages because he confers extra benefits upon us."

"Exactly."

"But suppose we feel that by paying a lot of money to one who is a benefactor we convert him into an injury or a menace to the community. Suppose we feel that to give the benefactor riches is to make the boon into a bane."¹

The wizard proceeds to argue that Socialists are at liberty to decline any man's services rather than consent to make the benefactor a rich man.

The theory of Socialists of Mr. Blatchford's school is that in the ideal community every man will have all that a man needs, and that it would be most unreasonable for the more highly gifted citizens to sulk and refuse to benefit their fellows because nothing can be given them beyond the essence of a happy and healthy life, with esteem and love to

Fabian essays on Socialism there is a chapter by Annie Besant, in which Mr. Blatchford's line is taken.

2. *English Opponents of Equality of Payment*.—The passages we have quoted hardly represent the newest thought in the world-wide Socialist army. Mr. Sidney Ball is much more closely in touch with his comrades when he writes—

"Modern Socialism . . . does not base industrial organization on 'the right to work' so much as on the right of the worker, not on 'payment according to needs' so much as on 'payment according to services': it recognizes the remuneration of ability, provided that the ability does not merely represent a monopoly of privileged and non-competitive advantage."⁴

¹ *The Sorcery Shop*, pp. 119, 120.

² *Ibid.* p. 123.

³ *Fabian Essays: Industry under Socialism*, pp. 163, 164.

⁴ *Socialism and Individualism*. Chapter on "The Moral Aspects of Socialism," by Sidney Ball, M.A. Fabian Socialist Series, No. 3.

Mr. H. G. Wells, it need hardly be said, does not contemplate any system of equal salaries for all. "Socialism," he says, "would leave men free to compete for fame, for service, *for salaries*, for position and authority, for leisure, for love and honour."¹ He encourages the elementary school-teacher with the prospect of higher payment,² and he adds—

"You will have no anxiety about sickness or old age; the State, the universal Friendly Society, will hold you secure against that; but if you like to provide extra luxury and dignity for your declining years . . . the State will be quite ready for you to pay it an insurance premium in order that you may receive in due course an extra annuity to serve the end you contemplate."³

Mr. Ramsay Macdonald says—

"Socialism proposes to establish no state of equality. It only proposes to adapt each organ to its natural function—to give to each man a chance of doing congenial work in the complex social life."⁴

Mr. F. W. Jowett, M.P., says that in the Socialist city "salaries must be liberal enough to attract the best men to the public service."⁵ He proposes larger consultation fees for specialists,⁶ to be paid jointly by associated corporations, and he wishes doctors to be placed above the reach of personal competition.

The truth is that hardly a single practical thinker among English Socialists contemplates equality of payment, except as a "devout imagination"; and when we turn to the newest foreign Socialist writers, we find that they are equally opposed to Mr. Blatchford's views.

¹ *New Worlds for Old*, p. 110.

² *Ibid.* p. 311.

³ *Ibid.* p. 312.

⁴ *Socialism*, p. 93.

⁵ *The Socialist's City*, p. 17.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 19.

II

Foreign views on Equal Rewards

The question of equality of payments came before German Socialists in a practical way in 1892, when the question of Liebkecht's salary as editor of *Vorwärts* was raised at the Berlin Congress. This paper, the property of the party, paid Liebkecht the modest salary of £360 a year. It was pointed out that the compositors engaged on this profitable journal did not make £50 a year, although their hours of labour were as long as the editor's. The extremer comrades could not see why a newspaper under their own control should be conducted on capitalistic rather than on Socialistic principles. When the question was brought up, Liebkecht declared that he could not live on a smaller income, and that he could earn three times as much money by selling his writings in a different market.¹ The Congress accepted his plea that in bourgeois society equality was impossible. And the most thoughtful minds in the German party admit that even in a Socialist State there could be no equal rewards for all.

1. *Influences which would Prevent Equality*.—Dr. Menger, in his chapter on "The Idea of Equality," remarks that complete economic equality would be possible only under an anarchist organization of society. In the Socialist State the following causes would work against it: (a) The distinction between the rulers and the ruled, which in his view will be even sharper under Socialism, because the governing class will extend their power over the whole economic domain;² (b) the wide differences in culture

¹ See Dr. John Rae's remarks on this incident in *Contemporary Socialism*, p. 524.

² *Neue Staatslehre*, p. 65.

and knowledge which would remain between individuals; ¹ (c) the varying amount and value of the work that would be accomplished by individuals; (d) the preponderating power which the most highly skilled artisans would have in the social revolution.

“As the middle-class revolutions of the eighteenth and nineteenth century worked chiefly for the advantage of the upper middle classes, the Socialist movement . . . will be peculiarly favourable to the interests of the most influential elements in the working class.”

2. *Danger to the State from a System of Equal Payments.*—Dr. Menger, in common with other Socialist leaders, sees that if the material motive to labour were taken away, men would sink into a kind of Quietism, and the supposed work-State would become a mere organization for the supply of daily victuals all round.² No one has written more forcibly than Dr. Menger on the folly of supposing that human nature will undergo a great change for the better under Socialism, and that self-interest will cease to be a powerful goad to action. Thus he says—

“I do not believe that the democratic work-State can take an essentially different attitude towards the play of human passions and efforts from that which is adopted by our present organization of politics. As long as each human being forms within the compass of his body a little world to himself, which feels keenly its own pain and its own pleasure, while it is touched only very indirectly by the joy and suffering of others, self-interest must ever remain the most imposing of all motives of human conduct. The establishment of the people’s work-State, will not, as so many

¹ On this point Dr. Menger remarks very truly that progress in all departments of science and technical knowledge is becoming more and more a matter for specialists. In view even of the costly and delicate apparatus which is necessary for scientific research, he laughs at the idea of Bebel that individuals will be able to carry on scientific studies as a hobby along with their manual labour, and the suggestion of Proudhon that instruction in science could be combined with a practical training in some mechanical art. P. 66.

² In his graphic phrase, *Ein Mast-und-Futter-Staat*, p. 68.

Socialist writers assume, accomplish this miracle, even although by the transformation of the property-system it removes the most powerful motive to self-seeking action."¹

Many Socialist systems, as Dr. Menger goes on, seek to base themselves from the beginning on the love of one's neighbour and on universal brotherhood. "It would be a dangerous error," he replies, "if we were to assume that even the most mighty overthrow of social institutions could essentially change the fundamental impulses of human nature."² It is true of this non-Christian philosopher, in contradiction to Rousseau and the more flattering teachers of modern Socialism, that he has

"launched point-blank his dart
At the head of a lie—taught Original Sin,
The Corruption of Man's Heart."

We must reckon, he says, with the continuance of evil as well as good passions in the breast of man. There is no moral "new birth" in Socialism.³ He desires that there should be a hierarchy in the Socialist State—not in Saint-Simon's theocratic sense, but for purely secular purposes. Whether the very object and meaning of Socialism would not be defeated by the re-establishment of the class-system is a problem which Dr. Menger does not face. The point which concerns us here is that he sees the impossibility of any plan of equal rewards for all workers.

Menger regards equality of payments as an idle and foolish dream; Kautsky lingers over the idea affectionately, and dismisses it reluctantly.⁴ He denies that Socialists ever cherished the communistic idea of "sharing out," though he admits that even highly cultured people assumed

¹ *Neue Staatslehre*, pp. 51, 52.

² *Ibid.* p. 53.

³ *Ibid.* p. 54.

⁴ See his long chapter on "The Division of Products in the Future State," *Das Erfurter Programm*, pp. 153-166.

until recently in Germany that Socialism meant the dividing up amongst the masses of all State property.

The most important lesson which Kautsky teaches is that only a fraction of the total products of the nation's industry could ever be available for distribution. Taxation would be exceedingly heavy, and in his view the wages of the working classes would not be greatly raised above their present standard unless production could be vastly quickened. The State would have to bear all the burdens which are now borne by capitalists. It would require a large sinking fund, an accumulation of wealth for possible need. It dare not imitate the improvidence of the grasshopper in La Fontaine's fable; for there would be no prudent ants in the shape of rich accumulators to whom an appeal might be made more successfully than in the poem. Mermeix asks the question: "Would social burdens be diminished; would 'Society' be less expensive than the present State?" He answers truly enough that all the writers who have discussed the "morrow of revolution"—men like Schaeffle, Kautsky, Renard, and Deslinières—take a pessimistic view.

In his book entitled *Le Régime Socialiste*, Georges Renard discusses at considerable length the question of work and its rewards under Socialism. He sees as clearly as Menger that even if, in a moment of lofty enthusiasm, the new State were to declare for equal incomes for all, the equality would very soon disappear, unless the entire social order were to be based on injustice. He thinks that special indulgence must be shown to scholars, artists, and inventors.

"As the value of the results of their labour, which is often immense, cannot be measured by the time it has cost, society will always be free to encourage an activity, which from its own point

of view is so precious, by granting to them on a generous scale the means of existence and of work, by securing to them ample and happy leisure, as if they were exceptional beings who had deserved well of the nation. Society, by the prizes it will thus offer for really creative work, will decide of itself what progress it wishes to make and what rank it desires to occupy among civilized peoples.”¹

For the general mass of workers, M. Renard would allow a scale of rewards sufficient to stimulate energy.

“A slight economic inequality may remain among the members of the same society, but this will tend to decrease with the more equal distribution of knowledge and capacity, and in proportion also as the growing sense of justice enables us to reward the effort rather than the result. Meanwhile this inequality will have nothing to do with the things that are indispensable to life. It will always be based on a real inequality of merit, and it will remain small in most cases.”²

Nearly all Socialists, as we have seen, recognize that for one reason or another, inequalities of payment must continue under a Socialist State. They promise, not strict equality, but a secure and comfortable existence to every citizen.

¹ *Le Régime Socialiste*, pp. 179, 180.

² *Ibid.* p. 41.

CHAPTER X

SOCIALISM AND THE FAMILY

WE now approach the most difficult and debatable part of our subject, for there is no question on which Socialists are more sensitive than that of their teaching on the family. They constantly accuse critics of misrepresenting their views, and the impartial inquirer must walk warily on this treacherous ground. We may say at once that we have no intention of hunting, either in the earlier or later Socialist literature, for the utterances of extremists; our citations will be fully representative of the opinions of moderate leaders, and we shall choose them, as before, mainly from the writings of the last ten years.

We need not linger for more than a sentence or two on the Socialist attitude on the housing question, which fills much space in their magazines and newspapers. All Liberals must earnestly sympathize with Socialists in their efforts to improve the homes of the people. One of the most instructive articles ever written on the housing problem in England was published by Eduard Bernstein in 1900.¹ Bernstein quoted with approval the remark of Mr. Haldane at a meeting of the Christian Social Union, that a Kitchener or a Roberts should be commissioned to sweep away the slums, and, he added, "The entire social question is grouped about the housing question." Half

¹ It appeared in the *Archiv für soziale Gesetzgebung*.

the evils which Socialists deplore in the family-life of the poorer classes would vanish with the provision of decent dwellings. "There is not a single statesman of any reputation," wrote Bernstein in 1900, "who does not consider that the present condition as regards housing and the legislation connected with it, ought to be altered." The housing problem in London alone appeared to the German Socialist critic like a many-headed hydra. He added, "It is incredible how much enthusiasm this human wilderness of London destroys." Liberals and Socialists can work as comrades in advancing these material reforms with which the moral welfare of the family is so closely entwined. No point of controversy arises here.

We may pass quickly over another favourite topic of constructive Socialists—the question, namely, of whether families under the new State would lead a barrack life or would have separate homes. As Dr. Menger sensibly remarks, the fact that small houses are already everywhere in existence seems to decide the general mode of living for several generations to come. The real question to which we seek an answer is, Would Socialism destroy the home? The great majority of the new Socialists answer with an indignant denial.

I

Some Recent Declarations of Socialists on the Family

Mr. Ramsay Macdonald says—

"The idea that Socialism is opposed to the family organization is absurd. . . . Nowhere and at no time was the abolition or even the weakening of the family incorporated in the Socialist creed. Indeed, much of the Socialist criticism has been directed against the debased form of the family—the loveless marriages, the cash instead of the affectionate bonds, the sale of daughters which is so

prevalent in capitalist and aristocratic society. Until women are free we cannot know what a real marriage is."¹

Mr. Blatchford, in *The Sorcery Shop*, expresses himself, through the wizard, to much the same effect.

In the Socialist Utopia into which the wizard has introduced the General and Mr. Jorkle, "There are," he says, "no laws. But there are customs. One of these customs is the custom of marriage—the custom of strict monogamy. . . . When a couple do discover that they are ill-sorted they may part; but generally they make the best of it, for the children's sake. But woman or man divorced has but a poor chance of a second marriage." . . .

"Come," said Mr. Jorkle, with a forensic air, "what about free love in this moral State?"

"All love here is free; that is why the relations of the sexes are so happy and so pure."

"But I always understood," the magnate persisted, "that under Socialism free love would ride rough-shod over every moral restraint, and that the family ideal would be destroyed. Do you mean to say it is not so here?"

"Some Socialists may have given cause for such a fear," said the wizard; "but there are few English Socialists who would endorse such extravagant ideas."²

Mr. Wells, whose ripened views on the family are given in *New Worlds for Old*, says—

"So far as the family is a name for a private property in a group of related human beings vested in one of them, the Head of the Family, Socialism repudiates it altogether as unjust and uncivilized; but so far as the family is a grouping of children with their parents, with the support and consent and approval of the whole community, Socialism advocates it, and would make it, for the first time, so far as a very large moiety of our population is concerned, a possible and efficient thing."³

Mr. Wells says further—

"Socialism does not present any theory whatever about the duration of marriage, whether, as among the Roman Catholics, it

¹ *Socialism*, pp. 94, 95.

² *The Sorcery Shop*, pp. 45-48.

³ *New Worlds for Old*, p. 131.

should be absolutely for life, or, as some hold, for ever ; or, as among the various divorce-permitting Protestant bodies, until this or that eventuality ; or even, as Mr. George Meredith suggested some years ago, for a term of ten years. In these matters Socialism does not decide, and it is quite reasonable to argue that Socialism need not decide."¹

Merlino expresses the opinion that the family will continue under Socialism. "We do not believe there will be a slackening of family bonds, but we believe other bonds will be added to them, and that men will not be any the less good fathers, brothers, husbands, because they will be better citizens."² Merlino's treatment of the subject is on a distinctly lower moral level, however, than that of most English Socialists. Some Italian writers are fond of toying with the idea of free love, perhaps because their hatred of the Christian religion is peculiarly strong.³

Kautsky says—

"The family of to-day is in no way inconsistent with the nature of co-operative production. Therefore, the carrying into practice of a Socialist order of society does not of itself in any way necessitate the dissolution of the existing family form."⁴

These repudiations in general terms might be multiplied to any extent, but when we have noted the fact that modern Socialists declare themselves broadly as in favour of upholding the family organization, we are only at the beginning of our subject. They are profoundly dissatisfied with

¹ *New Worlds for Old*, pp. 134, 135.

² *Formes et Essence du Socialisme*, p. 115.

³ Merlino says (p. 115). "La famille abandonnera son enveloppe légale, mais elle perfectionnera son contenu. Les relations sexuelles seront peut-être moins exclusives, mais elles seront aussi moins brutales." No one has written more contemptuously of the marriage relationship than Enrico Ferri, one of the foremost of the Italian leaders. Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, in his preface to the English translation of Prof. Ferri's book, *Socialism and Positive Science*, carefully separates himself from Ferri on this and other important questions.

⁴ *Das Erfurter Programm*, p. 146.

many aspects of family life, especially in the homes of the poor, and they desire to introduce drastic changes. When Socialists are asked, "Do you mean to abolish the family?" they frequently answer with mournful emphasis, "No, because it is abolished already. Our plan is rather to reconstruct it." Take, for instance, this passage from Kautsky—

"People accuse Social Democracy of seeking to get rid of the family. We are aware, it is true, that every special mode of industrial life has its special form of the household, to which a special family form must correspond. We do not believe that the present form of the family is the final form, and we expect that a new form of society will also develop a new family organization. But such an expectation is a very different thing from the attempt to dissolve every family bond. It is not the Socialists who are destroying the family—not only wishing to destroy, but actually doing it before our eyes; it is the capitalists. Many slave-owners in former days tore the husband from the wife, the parents from the children who were of an age to work; but capitalists go beyond the shameless deeds of slavery; they snatch the sucking child from its mother, and force her to entrust it to the hands of strangers."¹

II

The Darker Side of Family Life as Seen by Socialists

What are these glaring evils in the home life of the people against which Socialists utter a passionate protest?

(1) They assert that capitalism has always been the worst enemy of family life. It has forced women and children into mines and factories, and its true spirit was revealed in the cruelties that took place before the factory legislation. It has reduced men's wages to a point at which they had to be supplemented by the earnings of other members of the family. Individualists like M. Yves Guyot, it may be noted, write even now in cautious, grudging strains of

¹ *Das Erfurter Programm*, p. 41.

the liberation of young lives from long hours of wage-earning. There is a significant chapter in M. Guyot's volume on *Social Tyranny*, in which, while approving on the whole of the laws for the regulation of child labour in France, he says it is important that the law shall not be used in a nagging way, so as to persecute parents and employers. He thinks that young girls and children would be best kept out of mischief by staying on in the workshop or factory while their parents are there.

“What will they do outside? Is it not better for them to be beside their mother or their father? If the father works twelve hours, he will not leave until two hours after his children, one hour after his wife. Instead of their all going away together, each one will go off in his own direction. Do morality and the family gain anything by that? . . . Besides, in certain trades the collaboration of the child is indispensable. When he is gone the mother and the father may as well depart also. The supporters of the limitation of the hours of work glory in having obtained these results; but they have provoked crises, strikes, difficulties, and they have not added to the well-being of the home or to the prosperity of industry.”¹

If an able and enlightened publicist like M. Guyot is prepared to keep a child twelve hours a day in the factory, and fails even to understand why the wife should be released an hour earlier than her husband, if only that she may prepare his supper, can we wonder that Socialists believe that the seeds of slavery for the more helpless members of the family are still fermenting under the soil of our beneficent factory legislation? They point to the thousands of lads and girls in our great cities whose formative years are occupied with casual labour, who never have a chance to learn a trade, and they say, “Under Socialism we should change all that.”

¹ *La Tyrannie Socialiste*, p. 120.

"The industrial labour of women," says Kautsky, "means under capitalistic society the complete destruction of the workers' family life without its being replaced by a higher family form. The capitalistic method of production does not, in most cases, abolish the separate household of the worker, but it robs the home of all its brighter aspects, and allows only its darker features to continue; above all, the waste of strength and the exclusion of the woman from a wider life. Industrial labour by women to-day does not involve their release from housework, but the addition of a new burden to those they were bearing already. But we cannot serve two masters. The working-man's housekeeping goes to ruin if his wife is obliged to take her share in earning."¹

(2) Socialists declare that under the present economic system it is impossible that the members of our working-class families should ever know security or lasting happiness. The head of the household is haunted continually by the spectre of unemployment, and the age-limit in many trades is forty or forty-five. Mr. Keir Hardie says—

"As old age approaches—for the workman this may mean anything over forty—a cold, grey terror begins to take possession of his heart. Fight against it as he may, he cannot get away from the fact that within the circle of his acquaintance there are men just turned forty, as good workmen as himself, for whom the ordinary labour market no longer has any use. He knows his turn will also come some day. A slackness of trade, some petty offence which in a younger man would pass unnoticed, and out he goes, to return no more."²

Then the growing boys and girls have to set themselves along with the mother, to supply the wage which has been lost. East London workers in the poorest districts tell us that in many homes there is the wretched spectacle of a father permanently out of employment, though in the prime of life, while the children, striving by casual labour to supply immediate necessities, are losing their own chance of learning some skilled trade.

¹ *Das Erfurter Programm*, p. 40.

² *From Serfdom to Socialism*, pp. 54, 55.

(3) Socialists deny that virtue can flourish in poor homes under present conditions. They point, not only to the frightful results of overcrowding, but to the terrible social evil, as a direct result of capitalism. Under their imaginary commonwealth, it is claimed, that inky blot would disappear, but they give no convincing reasons for such an assurance. Kautsky says—

“The defencelessness of women, who have hitherto been shut up in their homes and who have only dim ideas of public life and the power of organization, is so great that the capitalist employer dares to pay them regularly wages which do not suffice for their maintenance, and to throw them back on prostitution for the additional amount required. The increase of women’s industrial labour shows everywhere a tendency to draw after it an increase of prostitution. In God-fearing and moral States there are ‘flourishing’ branches of industry whose workwomen are so badly paid that they would starve if they did not eke out their earnings by the wages of immorality. And the heads of these businesses say that it is only through the low scale of wages that they are able to meet the competition and to keep their concerns in a flourishing state. A higher scale of wages would ruin them.”¹

Kautsky uses these remarkable words in the same chapter: “Under the capitalistic system of production prostitution becomes one of the pillars of society.” The worst evil, he adds, which Socialists are accused of seeking to introduce into the State—the abolition of the sanctity of marriage—exists under capitalistic society, and can only be destroyed when the masses have gained economic freedom and independence.

Mr. H. G. Wells has discussed this painful subject temperately in *New Worlds for Old*, but many Continental Socialists use it as their strongest weapon against the propertied classes, whom they blame for the existence of moral evils in all civilized countries. “If the greedy rich

¹ *Das Erfurter Programm*, p. 42.

could be deprived of their wealth," say some Socialists, "the honour of the wives and daughters of the people would be safe." It is assumed, in such arguments, that the wickedness of human nature is concentrated in the hearts of the wealthy, that "the proletariat" has no vices, and that the only dangers to innocence and virtue come to the children of the poor from those who are far above them in the social scale. Do the common facts of experience bear out these assumptions?

III

Changes which Socialists Seek to Introduce into Family Life

The ablest of recent constructive Socialists, Dr. Anton Menger, prefaced his chapters on family life under the new State with a careful examination of Socialist teaching on free love. Fully recognizing that some of the earlier philosophers, notably those of the Saint-Simonian school, had done infinite mischief by the sensuality of their doctrines, Menger did not imitate the violence of Kautsky's tone towards those "moral monsters" the capitalists; but asked, calmly, What is the attitude of the new Socialists towards the theory of free love which has been propounded by some of their most trusted leaders, among whom he named especially Bebel and William Morris.¹

The passage in William Morris's writings to which Dr. Menger refers is fairly typical of the views of the anarchical section of Socialists.

"Many violent acts," wrote Morris,² "came from the artificial

¹ In a note he says: "Godwin and Owen, though they wished to maintain the institution of marriage, still approached very closely to free love, because they approved of a great loosening of the marriage bond."—*Neue Staatslehre*, p. 126.

² Morris. *News from Nowhere*, pp. 89, 90. 10th Edition. 1908.

perversion of the sexual passions, which caused overweening jealousies and the like miseries. Now, when you look carefully into these you will find that what lay at the bottom of them was mostly the idea (a law-made idea) of the woman being the property of the man, whether he were husband, father, brother, or what not. *That* idea has, of course, vanished with private property, as well as certain follies about the 'ruin' of women for following their natural desires in an illegal way, which, of course, was a convention caused by the laws of private property. Another cognate cause of crimes of violence was the family tyranny, which was the subject of so many novels and stories of the past, and which once more was the result of private property. Of course that is all ended, since families are held together by no bond of coercion, legal or social, but by mutual liking and affection, and everybody is free to come and go as he or she pleases."

Socialists like those of Oneida and Wallingford in America accepted what they called a "complex marriage system." Both these forms of family relationship naturally assume that the care and education of the children will fall upon the community. Yet a third class of Socialists have been attracted by Plato's idea of a State-marriage, which applied, it may be noted, only to the aristocratic and ruling classes in the State, and had as its object the rearing of a select type of richly endowed beings, who should combine the physical and mental excellencies of the most beautiful and gifted parents.

The ideas of *Enfantin*, the chief follower and interpreter of Saint-Simon, lay somewhere between the notion of a "complex marriage" and a State union. His teaching was steeped in sensuality, and his immediate followers revolted against his proposal that a licence to immorality should be granted to the priest and priestess of his strange sect, and that they should regulate the love affairs of their flock. The mere formulating of such theories proved sufficient to produce an irreparable breach in the hitherto flourishing school of Saint-Simon and *Enfantin*.

Fourier, in his *Théorie des Quatre Mouvements*,¹ proposed that free love should be legally permissible to all girls over eighteen, while at the same time he desired to uphold marriage, at least during his "sixth transitional period," for persons of riper years. In the seventh period, when, according to Fourier, a higher stage of development would have been reached, each woman was to be allowed a husband and an indefinite number of lovers. In every attempt to realize in practice the social ideas of Fourier, his monstrous notions on the family were set aside, and he himself, in later writings, relegated them to a distant future.

The new Socialists, with rare exceptions, repudiate altogether the ideas of such leaders as Morris, Bebel, and in earlier times Infantin and Fourier, on the building up of the home. The most contemptuous writing on marriage is to be found, as we have said, in the works of Italian Socialists, and particularly of Professor Ferri. We may note also this passage from Dr. Menger—

"Could free love or complex marriage be put in place of our present system of marriage? We are certainly wrong in rejecting this reform, as is so often done, from the standpoint of morality. A condition like free love or complex marriage, through which most peoples have passed in the course of their development, cannot possibly be regarded as immoral. If the social movement were to lead men back towards these arrangements, and if they were gradually to win the support of the majority of the people, the fanatical upholders of the actual would regard them as the only moral organization of sexual life."²

Dr. Menger, however, proceeds at once to say that the immense task which lies before Socialists would be made infinitely more complicated and burdensome if they

¹ *Theory of the Four Movements*. 1808. This was Fourier's earliest important work.

² *Neue Staatslehre*, p. 131.

Fourier, in his *Théorie des Quatre Mouvements*,¹ proposed that free love should be legally permissible to all girls over eighteen, while at the same time he desired to uphold marriage, at least during his "sixth transitional period," for persons of riper years. In the seventh period, when, according to Fourier, a higher stage of development would have been reached, each woman was to be allowed a husband and an indefinite number of lovers. In every attempt to realize in practice the social ideas of Fourier, his monstrous notions on the family were set aside, and he himself, in later writings, relegated them to a distant future.

The new Socialists, with rare exceptions, repudiate altogether the ideas of such leaders as Morris, Bebel, and in earlier times Infantin and Fourier, on the building up of the home. The most contemptuous writing on marriage is to be found, as we have said, in the works of Italian Socialists, and particularly of Professor Ferri. We may note also this passage from Dr. Menger—

"Could free love or complex marriage be put in place of our present system of marriage? We are certainly wrong in rejecting this reform, as is so often done, from the standpoint of morality. A condition like free love or complex marriage, through which most peoples have passed in the course of their development, cannot possibly be regarded as immoral. If the social movement were to lead men back towards these arrangements, and if they were gradually to win the support of the majority of the people, the fanatical upholders of the actual would regard them as the only moral organization of sexual life."²

Dr. Menger, however, proceeds at once to say that the immense task which lies before Socialists would be made infinitely more complicated and burdensome if they

¹ *Theory of the Four Movements*. 1808. This was Fourier's earliest important work.

² *Neue Staatslehre*, p. 131.

attempted to "reform" the marriage laws, and he sums up his views in the following noteworthy passage, which would be subscribed by the most respectable class of Socialists in every country in Europe—

"But even if the general conditions for such a reform existed, the nations would certainly reject free love or complex unions, and firmly maintain the present form of marriage, which, however, must not be indissoluble, as with the Roman Catholics, but terminable, as in the Protestant marriage law, on important grounds. . . . There are so many defects associated with free love that the masses of the people would themselves refuse to permit it, even if in the course of events all those political and ecclesiastical forces which buttress the present monogamic system had been condemned to silence."¹

The Rev. Stewart D. Headlam writes—

"What is known as 'Free Love,' which is probably neither 'free' nor 'love,' may be right or may be wrong; but whether right or wrong, it has nothing whatever to do with Socialism, which simply aims at the tremendous revolution of getting the great means of production out of the hands of the monopolists into the hands of the people."²

Socialists who never mention save with abhorrence the teaching of earlier leaders on "free love," desire, however, to introduce two far-reaching changes into the life of woman. They desire (a) to secure her complete economic independence, and (b) to facilitate divorce in cases of unsatisfactory marriage.

Economic Freedom of Women

There is hardly a Socialist book in any language which does not insist on the necessity of freeing married women

¹ *Neue Staatslehre*, p. 132.

² *The Socialist's Church*, pp. 50, 51. Mr. Headlam, it may be noted, entirely disapproves of the theory of the "endowment of motherhood" which is advocated by Mr. Wells. "The theory," he says, "finds favour with those bureaucrats who are hardly worthy of the name of Socialists."—P. 51.

from dependence for support on their husbands. Mr. Ramsay Macdonald says, for instance—

“The economic independence of women would go far to secure their proper treatment after marriage; a substantial increase in the price of their labour would enable women to retain self-respect, and release the mother from the weary double toil of factory and home; an appreciation, such as the Socialist has, of the importance of the function of motherhood would place the married woman in a position of proud independence, and would not doom her, as she is now doomed, to a slavish dependence.”¹

It must be clearly understood that by “the economic independence of women” Socialists mean that all women, like all men, shall be under the obligation to work as wage-earners in one capacity or another. Wives who were engaged in rearing young families would be held to have discharged their full duty to the State, and would be supported, either by the husband’s labour, as Dr. Menger suggests,² or, since this would involve dependence on the husband, by the right to draw a maintenance from a common fund. It need hardly be said that an extreme vagueness characterizes all references to this “mothers’ bank,” and we have found no practical suggestion as to the method of raising the money. Probably the funds required would be provided by direct taxation.

In the case of childless couples, the question would arise as to whether the duties of the home would provide sufficient occupation for the wife. Socialists say that as by labour-saving machinery or a collectivist plan of living the duties of the household, in their State, will become almost nominal, the wife will be expected, where there are no children, to enrol herself, like her husband, among the workers of the land, and to earn her full week’s wage.

¹ *Socialism*, p. 97.

² *Neue Staatslehre*, p. 134.

"The wife," says Mr. Wells, "will probably have an occupation, and be a teacher, a medical practitioner, a government clerk or official, an artist, a milliner, and earn her own living. In which case they (the husband and wife) will share apartments, perhaps, and dine in a club, and go about together very much as a childless couple of journalists or artists or theatrical people do in London to-day. But, of course, if either of them chooses to idle more or less, and live on the earnings of the other, that will be a matter quite between themselves. No one will ask who pays their rent and their bills; that will be for their own private arrangement."¹

Socialists of the type of Mr. Belfort Bax, it may be remarked, would not agree with Mr. Wells on the permissible idleness of women whose husbands or other male relatives are willing to work for them. Mr. Bax argues that women are far too indulgently treated under our modern society, and he would expect them to take their full share in the labours of the Socialist State. Mr. Blatchford, we see from *The Sorcery Shop*, has no idea of encouraging an industrially parasitic class of women, though he argues as if the Socialist State would be organized like a picnic party or summer camp.

In actual experience the obligation to work outside the home would fall very heavily upon women, and especially, as Dr. Menger remarks, on those who had been accustomed to a life of ease and comfort. In his famous *Letter to Women*, Georges Renard says: "Never allow yourselves to forget that your ideal is not an imaginary *equality* with man, but a legitimate *equivalence* with him. That means that in the family, as in society, you will have a place which is as high and as wide as his: though a different place."²

¹ *New Worlds for Old*, pp. 314, 315.

² The *Lettre aux Femmes* appeared originally in the *Revue Socialiste*, and is published as a pamphlet by Messrs. Giard et Brière. It was translated into English for the *Clarion*, and into German for *Die Frauenbewegung*.

But Dr. Menger sets the "ideal" in the cold light of reality when he says: "That equal position, like every important victory, must be purchased for women by their accepting the sacrifice involved in the universal obligation to work."

In his chapter on punishments, he shows that in his work-State heavy penalties will fall upon the lazy.

Dr. Menger had looked more deeply into the nature of the Socialist State than Mr. Wells, and he was not the dupe of those perfectionist notions which still flit through the brains of some builders of castles of indolence. There would be no boudoirs in the Socialist castle. Stern necessity would force the executive to demand from every able-bodied citizen the maximum of production. Idle and pampered women would be so loathed that their existence would become intolerable.

The Question of Easy Divorce

It is assumed by most Socialist writers who uphold the institution of marriage that facilities for divorce would be increased under their imaginary State. The matter is put with great clearness by M. Renard—

"Socialism desires, in the first place, that the union of man and woman should become more and more a free marriage between two persons who respect and love each other, a voluntary association of two spouses who, without requiring the consent of any outsider, set up house together by a private contract. Society has only to register this contract in the simplest form, but it cannot dispense with it, because of the difficulties which might arise on questions connected either with their children or with their common property. It is certainly desirable, for the good of individuals as well as of society, that this contract should last as long as possible; but this is no reason why we should declare it eternal. It may therefore be broken by the wish of both parties, or even of one of them, provided that this wish be clearly and (if

this be thought desirable) repeatedly expressed; and after legal delays, which will serve as precautions against too hasty action. The attempt to maintain the union, when one of the partners has definitely decided to break it, leads to the worst quarrels or the worst hypocrisies. In the name of liberty, as of good order, we must allow two beings who do not wish to live together any longer to go their own way after a peaceable separation. Divorce is in such cases the only right and honourable solution; and society, when certain reservations have been made, has merely the task of registering the dissolution of the conjugal bond, as it registered its formation."¹

The reservations which M. Renard has in mind need not be set out in full. He is aware that easy divorce might bear very heavily upon the weaker partner, who might find herself deserted at the time when she was least able to provide for her maintenance. But he reminds us that under Socialism all measures for facilitating divorce would be bound up with those for the economic independence of women.

The law, that is, must see to it, according to his argument, that the mother of children, who finds herself deserted by her husband after a legal divorce, shall not be thrown aside without means of subsistence, or expected to do the full economic task of a woman who had not already rendered the highest service to the State. The children of divorced persons are to be maintained by contributions from the parents, proportioned according to their means.

A distinct tendency towards the loosening of the marriage bond characterizes modern Socialist literature.

The Lot of the Child under Socialism

The New Socialists, it may be added, have no idea of taking little children from their parents and bringing them

¹ *Le Socialisme à l'Œuvre*, p. 422.

up on a Spartan barrack system. It is admitted that the State must watch much more closely over the welfare of each young life than is possible under our present regulations; and ultimately, as we have seen, the life-task must be apportioned according to the needs of the community.

A very happy life for children is foreshadowed in the writings of Socialists. The father, they say, will no longer be absolute monarch in the household, for the mother will possess equal authority and enjoy equal honour. No longer will there be any homes in which children remain all day neglected, because both parents are out at work. The State will take over the charge of children whose parents, whether through their fault or their misfortune, are unable to provide them with proper tendance. Otherwise we find little trace in the newer Socialist literature of any disposition to disturb the present relations between parents and children.

We do not propose to linger on the subject of child-training, for the views of Socialists are closely akin to those of Liberals. The question of population, on which writers like Dr. Menger have uttered earnest warnings, also lies beyond our limits. The chief fear of some thinkers is that under the ideal conditions to which human life, as they believe, would attain under Socialism, "too many guests might be summoned to the banquet of life,"¹ and that over-population might bring back the hungry years

¹ *Le Socialisme à l'Œuvre*, p. 425.

CHAPTER XI

SOCIALISM AND RELIGION

AT the beginning of our inquiry we quoted the remark of Werner Sombart, that violent attacks upon religion are now to be heard only in half-educated circles. The decision of the Erfurt Congress, that religion was a private concern of the individual, with which Socialism in its corporate capacity had nothing to do, is confirmed and upheld to this day at party meetings. The new Socialists, especially in England, would repudiate with disgust such attacks on religion as those of Paul Lafargue and Belfort Bax. Infinite harm, as they feel, has been done to their cause by the comrade who has flaunted his infidelity in the face of the world, thus arousing a needless opposition. With the Prince of Arragon, one of Portia's suitors, they seek a safer leadership than that of the teacher who,

"like the martlet

Builds in the weather on the outward wall,
Even in the force and road of casualty."

The new Socialists, however, cannot let religion alone, for the subject possesses an irresistible fascination for their ablest writers, and this branch of their literature forms a study in itself. The best recent examination of their position is that of the Belgian leader, Émile Vandervelde, in his *Socialist Essays*.¹ M. Vandervelde is well known

¹ *Essays Socialistes*, pp. 103-183. (Félix Alcan. 1906.)

in England, and belongs, like Bernstein, to the moderate section of the party. His humanitarianism has lately been revealed in his untiring efforts on behalf of the oppressed subjects of King Leopold in the Congo Free State. We shall take him as our guide in a few preliminary remarks.

In his essay on "Socialism and Religion," M. Vandervelde quotes with approval the complaint of Robert Michels of "the international incoherences of contemporary Socialism," and points out that these incoherences have been conspicuous in the attitude of Parliamentary Socialists towards religious questions.

"At the very time when the Social Democrats of Germany were voting for the recall of the Jesuits, the French Socialists, in league with the Radicals, were driving out the congregations, and in the Italian Chamber, on February 29, 1904, it was a Socialist deputy, Annibale Vigna, who found fault with the Home Minister for having appointed the Jesuit Father Ehrle to the national library of Turin, and who demanded the inflexible application of the law of August 25, 1848, which expelled the Jesuits from Italian territory."¹

Amidst the "shocking contradictions" of Socialist Parliamentary tactics, M. Vandervelde discovers one or two principles which govern the thought and action of Socialist parties in all lands with regard to religious questions—

(a) In the first place, there is to be no interference with personal beliefs.²

"In every country Social Democracy numbers thousands of adherents who continue to practise one or other form of worship, whether from obedience to custom or from genuine conviction."

¹ *Essais Socialistes*, p. 104. (Félix Alcan. 1906.)

² As the solitary exception to this rule which he has been able to find, M. Vandervelde quotes the resolution of the *Parti ouvrier socialiste révolutionnaire* of France on August 22, 1901, which pledged its members to perform no act of religious worship.—*Ibid.* p. 106. This exception, as he says, only serves to prove the rule,

(b) "On the other hand," M. Vandervelde continues, "there can be no question that the immense majority of the leaders of the Socialist parties are absolute strangers to all positive religion. Even those who consider that anti-Clericalism is only a matter of secondary importance, and who preach the strictest neutrality as regards religion, are often themselves entirely emancipated from all religious belief."

(c) M. Vandervelde's third point is that in all countries, even in those where Socialism claims to have no concern with religious disputes, the Catholic Church and (with no less bitterness sometimes) the non-Catholic State Churches, denounce it as "a deadly plague."

"The orthodox Churches are everywhere the strongest supporters of capitalism in its efforts to dominate the masses. It is not surprising that the proletariat, finding that the Churches bar their way and recognizing the 'alliance between the safe and the altar,' should be almost irresistibly led to take the offensive and to fight, not only against capitalism, but against its allies."

He goes on—

"Whether the fact pleases or distresses us, it is certain that notwithstanding all the Socialist declarations as to the privacy of religious beliefs, the great mass, and above all the directing nucleus of the workers' parties, is composed almost exclusively of Free-thinkers, and that on the other hand the heads of the Catholic Church, and of all Churches which resemble it, inculcate upon their members a horror of 'atheistic, materialist, anti-religious Socialism.'"

I

The Attitude of the Newer Socialists towards Religion

(a) *Views of English Socialists.*—Many English Socialists would condemn the statements we have quoted from

M. Vandervelde as too extreme. They are anxious for the goodwill of the Churches, and labour to bring the doctrines of Socialism into harmony with New Testament teaching.

Mr. Keir Hardie says—

“It cannot be too emphatically stated that Socialism takes no more cognizance of the religious opinions of its adherents than does either Liberalism or Conservatism. It would, however, be an easy task to show that Communism, the final goal of Socialism, is a form of social economy very closely akin to the principles set forth in the Sermon on the Mount.”¹

Mr. Hardie hopes that Socialism “will be, if not a religion in itself, at least a handmaiden to religion, and as such entitled to the support of all who pray for the coming of Christ’s kingdom upon earth.”²

Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, while admitting the “occasional association of Socialist and anti-Christian propaganda,” denies that Socialism and Secularism are one and the same.

“Socialism,” he says, “has no more to do with a man’s religion than it has with the colour of his hair. Socialism deals with secular things, not with ultimate beliefs. . . . Nonconformity has trained our speakers in its pulpits, and has fashioned our devoted workers in its Sunday-schools. The Church has shed not a little of the light of its countenance upon us. . . . Christianity at its best has always appeared in the world with Communism at its right hand. In short, there is nothing in the Socialist theory, nothing in the Socialist method, antagonistic to religion.”³

A wide gulf separates English Socialists of the class to whom many Free Church pulpits are gladly thrown open from avowed opponents of Christianity like Mr. Blatchford and Mr. Quelch.

¹ *From Serfdom to Socialism*, p. 36.

³ *Socialism*, pp. 101-103.

² *Ibid.* p. 44.

Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, in another book, expresses the belief that "within the scope of the communal organization of industry there will be a need for smaller groups, such as trade-unions, *churches*, families." He approves of a Church which will attend "with enthusiastic care to the life, and not merely to the dogma, of Christianity."¹

Mr. H. G. Wells says—

"Socialism will touch nothing living or religion, and if you are a religious minister, you will be very much as you are at the present time, but with lightened parochial duties. If you are an earnest woman and want to nurse the sick and comfort the afflicted, you will need only, in addition to your religious profession, to qualify as a nurse or medical practitioner. There will still be ample need of you. Socialism will not make an end of human trouble, either of the body or of the soul, albeit it will put these things into such comfort and safety as it may."²

(b) *Views of French Socialists*.—Although French Socialism in the twentieth century appears to be indissolubly bound up, not only with anti-Clericalism, but with hostility to the Christian faith, we may note in passing that during the first half of the nineteenth century many French Socialists proclaimed themselves disciples of Christ. M. Vandervelde describes one of their banquets, held in April 1848, at which "toasts" were drunk "To Christ, the Father of Socialism," "To the coming of God on earth," and "To the living Christ."³ Socialists in 1848 regarded themselves as called not to destroy, but to fulfil the Gospel. In the matter of religion, they did not view the rich as their natural enemies, or share the opinion of Joseph de Maistre, that "every patrician is a lay-priest." Much of

¹ *Socialism and Society*, p. 185.

² *New Worlds for Old*, pp. 330-331.

³ *Essais Socialistes*, pp. 130-131. The account of the banquet is taken from Proudhon's paper, *Le Peuple*.

the hatred of religion which has grown up among the working classes in France is the result of teaching like that of M. de Maistre, who gloried in the close union between the Church and the capitalist, and declared that religion is the wealthy patrician's "first and most sacred property, because it preserves his privilege." "A noble can commit no greater crime," wrote Joseph de Maistre, "than to attack dogmas." He and his friends would have liked, as Vandervelde remarks, to organize "a trust of the gods," for the defence of society against the attacks of Collectivism. The working classes in France were taught, and are taught to this day, by Socialists, that the Churches are the friends of the rich and the enemies of the poor, and that the priests wish to crush down every legitimate aspiration of the democracy.

The result of such teaching became evident a few years ago, when M. Jaurès, the most trusted of French Socialist leaders, allowed his daughter to be prepared for her first Communion. M. Gustave Téry, in his interesting study of Jaurès, which appeared in 1907,¹ describes the sensation aroused amongst international comrades as the tidings became known. One "stalwart from the Danube" questioned the French leader in these insolent and blasphemous words: "Eh, bien! quoi, Jaurès, pendant que vous nous faites manger du curé, vous faites bouffer le bon Dieu à vot' demoiselle?"—"Why, what's this, Jaurès? Are you letting your young lady stuff herself with the wafer, while you make us eat up the priests?"

M. Téry, whose sympathies may be guessed from the fact that he describes the dome of the Sacré-Cœur as like an immense extinguisher, pressed downwards by an invisible hand to extinguish Paris, the City of Light,

¹ *Jean Jaurès*. Librairie Félix Juven, 1907, pp. 151, 152.

tells that M. Aristide Briand, the present French Premier, was obliged to excuse Jaurès in this matter before the general committee of the Socialist party. The debate on the "Jaurès Case" lasted more than a month, and opinion was all but unanimous against him. The friends of the leader were disposed to lay the blame on his wife, and reproached Jaurès for showing a weakness in managing his household which might cause trouble in many "Free-thinking" homes. It was argued that mothers would demand religious instruction for their children, justifying themselves by the example of M. and Madame Jaurès. "Get rid of the bourgeois family," cried some extremists, "then all these inconsistencies will disappear." Jaurès himself, it need scarcely be added, had always been known, not merely as an anti-Clericalist, but as a free-thinker.

As an example of the views on religion held by a moderate French Socialist, we may quote from a small work of Georges Renard, entitled *Paroles d'Avenir*.¹ It is written in the form of letters to a young man of twenty who has received a good education, and its purpose is to explain to him the primary teachings of Socialism.

M. Renard says to his young friend—

"You are a Free-thinker. Why do you repudiate Catholic and even Christian doctrine? It is not only because it shocks your reason by affirmations which are contrary to truth, because it does not correspond to our scientific notion of the universe; but also because it appears to you, from the moral point of view, inferior and insufficient. A changeable God, who repents, avenges Himself, and corrects His own work by impulsive actions called miracles; an executioner God, who catches His weak creatures in the snare of cunningly laid temptations, and punishes the fault of an individual in his children and his children's children to the thousandth generation; a Church that condemns

¹ *Bibliothèque Socialiste*, Paris, 17 Rue Cujas, 1904.

for all eternity every one who thinks differently from itself—as if we could think what we wish to think—all these old ideas of a child-humanity are repugnant to the idea of justice which the slow evolution of centuries has caused to bud and blossom in the men of to-day.”¹

From scepticism, M. Renard advises his young friend to advance to Socialism. He offers him “a new ideal, a human ideal which is greater, more beautiful, more worthy of love, and capable of infinite perfectibility.”²

“You may preserve,” he adds, “the best thing that there is in Christianity—that vague and gentle precept of the Gospel: Love one another. But you may do so only on the condition that you interpret and apply it in a different way from that of the Christian Churches.”³

A bitter hatred against Christianity breathes through the writings of some French Socialists who would shudder at the profanities of Paul Lafargue. Georges Renard passes in review the attitude of the Churches towards slavery in the past and towards the poorest classes in our own day, and he proudly declares that Socialists have a higher moral standard.

(c) *Views of Italian Socialists.*—Some of the most uncompromising attacks on religion come from the Italians. Professor Ferri has declared that the tolerance of Socialism, as proclaimed at Erfurt, is based on confidence in a final victory—

“It is because Socialism knows and foresees that religious beliefs, whether we consider them with M. Sergi as pathological phenomena of human psychology or as useless phenomena of moral incrustation, must waste away before the extension of even elementary scientific culture; it is for that reason that Socialism does not feel the necessity of fighting specially these same religious beliefs which are destined to disappear. It has taken this attitude

¹ *Paroles d'Avenir*, pp. 10, 11.

² *Ibid.* p. 11.

³ *Ibid.*

even though it knows that the absence or lessening of the belief in God is one of the most powerful factors in its extension, because the priests of all religions have been, in all phases of history, the powerful allies of the governing classes, in keeping the masses bent under the yoke, thanks to religious fascination, as the tamer keeps wild beasts under his whip.”¹

The late Professor Antonio Labriola contemplated the expected coming disappearance of Christianity with a wistfulness which is in singular contrast to the exulting infidelity of Ferri. “I do not know,” he wrote, “whether the men of the future will produce religions or not. What I do see clearly is only this, that Christianity, which is, in substance, the religion of the peoples who up to the present time have been highest in the scale of civilization, will not leave room for any new religion to follow it. In the future those who are not Christians will be entirely without religion.”²

(d) *Views of German Leaders.*—The great leaders of German Marxian Socialism have been, almost without exception, hostile to Christianity. We may recall the words of Liebknecht to the Congress at Halle—

“In my long political career, I have learned that neither insults nor attacks upon religion have succeeded in shaking the faith of a single believer. We may dethrone religion by setting science against it. We must mobilize the school against the Church, the teacher against the priest. A strong and enlightened education turns minds away from religion. A fighting policy, on the other hand, works to the advantage of our opponents; and those of our party who make war upon religion are falling into the same mistake as that of the Prussian Government when it fought against the Catholic Church and made the enemy stronger than before.”

The German Socialist leaders must have read with detestation some inquotable passages which will be familiar to students of the French Marxian propaganda; but in

¹ *Socialism and Positive Science*, p. 31.

² *Socialisme et Philosophie*, p. 181.

their own writings there is more contempt, if less hatred, and an equally firm conviction that Christianity must disappear, more or less swiftly, from the Socialist State.

Karl Kautsky wrote in 1885 in *Die Neue Zeit*¹ a very bitter article on the origins of Christianity. He treated the Gospels as pamphlets which might have emanated from the anti-Socialist camp. Christianity, according to his argument, had enslaved men. It had inspired in their breasts "the longing for redemption by a Cæsar or a God—not by their own personal energy; self-humiliation towards the heavenly powers, priestly usurpation over the masses."

The years have passed, and Kautsky's deeper thought is expressed in the pamphlet he published six years ago under the title, *Social Democracy and the Catholic Church*.²

In this pamphlet he argues that the Roman Catholic Church, "in France, Germany, Belgium, Holland, Austria, and Spain," is setting herself against the masses in their forward strivings. He declines to discuss the action of Protestant Churches, whether established or non-established; and if his chapters had been occupied solely with an attack on the Church which has pronounced Socialism to be a deadly plague, Protestant readers might have safely ignored them. It is but too clear, however, that in attacking the Church of Rome, Kautsky directs his sharpest weapons against Christianity. He cannot bear to contemplate the thought that mankind should need a Redeemer. He quotes with a touching assent that saying of the early German heathen prince who had heard from a missionary of the death of Christ upon the Cross. "If

¹ Vol. iii. pp. 481-499.

² *Die Sozialdemokratie und die katholische Kirche*. Second revised edition, 1906. (Berlin, Buchhandlung Vorwärts.)

only I and my warriors had been there! We should soon have put an end to His tormentors.”¹

The proud Germanic peoples which swept down on Christian Rome, says Kautsky, felt no need of a Saviour. “They felt within themselves the power to rescue Him.”

We find Kautsky admitting that it is possible to be a Socialist and at the same time a Christian, and he acknowledges that the German standpoint on this vitally important question differs from that of French comrades.² But he feels, in common with all non-Christian Socialists, that the Church has made herself the willing slave of the “Haves”; a lover of wealth and gain. There are some heart-searching words in his pamphlet, which must inspire the wish that such an honest and fair-minded Socialist could see the work of our institutional churches and our great central missions, or join the Bishop of London on his midnight marches in the slums. In Kautsky’s thought the Christian Churches are still prepared to honour the man with the gold ring, and their ideal functionary is the elder at the plate. Still, he has softened his views since 1885, as we see from the admission that “the Socialist movement stands nearer to Primitive Christianity than perhaps any other modern movement, for both originated among the masses.”

“It was indeed the helpless, begging multitude, not the defiant, fighting proletariat, which put the earliest stamp on Christianity; but the striving of the masses for the abolition of class-distinction is perfectly reconcilable with the Christian teaching of the Gospels.”³

Something has been gained when we find such a leader

¹ *Die Sozialdemokratie und die katholische Kirche*, p. 7.

² *Ibid.* p. 8.

³ *Ibid.* p. 8.

as Kautsky acknowledging that it is possible to be a good Christian and also a Socialist.

At the same time, Kautsky makes his own position perfectly clear. In the preface to the recently published pamphlet from which we have quoted he says—

“The belief in a personal God (‘impersonal’ as applied to God is an empty word) and a personal immortality, is irreconcilable with the present position of scientific knowledge in general, of which scientific Socialism forms a part which cannot be arbitrarily separated from the whole. It is specially difficult to reconcile with scientific Socialism the idea of a God-man or a superman, whose mission was to redeem mankind by the power of his personality or to lift men to a higher stage of existence.”

A quiet but deep enmity towards the Christian Churches breathes through the Socialist writings of Dr. Menger, and not least through his small posthumous work published under the title *Volkspolitik*.

II

Constructive Socialism and the Churches

Constructive Socialists recognize that religion, far more than property, “holds man by every fibre,” and for that reason they are constantly returning to the question of the Churches and their future under a Collectivist State. The message of Socialism, as they are well aware, was received by thousands of the working people as a religious message. “In earlier years,” writes Bernstein, “it repeatedly happened to me, and no doubt to others also, that labourers or artisans, who had heard a Socialist speech for the first time, came to me at the close of a meeting and explained to me that everything I had said was in the Bible, and that they could show me the passages text by text.”¹

¹ *Die Voraussetzungen des Sozialismus*, p. 141, Note.

(1) We may note, in the first place, that all Socialists are Disestablishers. If the Churches are to remain, they must exist as free institutions. Here are two typical passages :

From Mr. H. G. Wells.—"It seems most convenient in a Socialist State to leave religious worship entirely to the care of private people ; to let them subscribe among themselves, subject, of course, to a reasonable statute of mortmain, to lease land and build and endow and maintain churches and chapels, altars and holy places and meeting-houses, priests and devout ceremonies. This will be the more easily done since the heavy social burthens that oppress religious bodies at the present time will be altogether lifted from them ; they will have no poor to support, no schools, no hospitals, no nursing sisters, the advance of civilization will have taken over these duties of education and humanity that Christianity first taught us to realize."¹

From M. Vandervelde.—"Since religion ought not to be a public matter, Socialists seek to realize the complete separation of the Churches from the State, the absolute secularization of all the public services, and especially those of education and beneficence."²

(2) Socialists draw a distinction between the various Christian Churches in their relations to the "proletariat," and a peculiar animosity towards the Church of Rome may be observed in the writings of many Continental leaders.

Kautsky says, for example, that the Roman Church "is the sworn enemy of every revolutionary movement."

"She bends indeed before a victorious revolution, but she meets a struggling, fighting revolutionary class only with weapons of war. She hates most deeply all attempts to get rid of exploitation and class distinctions. The relics of the peculiar Communism of her early beginnings, which we find in the various forms of care for the sick and poor and for the education of children, serve only to draw away large masses of the 'Have-nots' from their class-movement."

¹ *New Worlds for Old*, p. 330.

² *Essais Socialistes*, p. 113.

In modern China great difficulties have been caused by the interference of Roman Catholic missionaries in politics and by their ambition to hold the rank of Mandarin; and it is with the Roman clergy rather with the distinctive tenets of their Church that Socialism goes to war. On this point Kautsky says—

“Although Social Democracy respects every religious conviction and declares that such convictions are a matter of private concern for each individual; and although the doctrines of New Testament Christianity may be harmonized with our aims, it is none the less true that Socialism in its struggle constantly meets the opposition of that authority which rules the Catholic religion, considered as a religion of the masses—the clergy.”

While their strongest hostility is reserved for the Church of Rome, foreign Socialists believe that the Protestant State Churches are scarcely less disposed to worship wealth and position, and they view even the Free Churches with scornful and suspicious eyes.

M. Vandervelde is an exception to this rule. He sees that the decision of the Erfurt Congress that religion was a matter for the individual is in perfect harmony with the spirit of Protestantism, but could never be honestly accepted in Roman Catholic countries, “where the mere affirmation that religion is a private matter is directly opposed to the pretensions of the Church.”¹

(3) Socialists accept the principle of toleration for the Churches, though a few, like Ferri, accept it grudgingly. “The Erfurt comrades,” says Ferri in effect, “would never have taken such an indulgent line had they not known that the Churches are feeble, dying organisms.” There are contemptuous allusions to toleration scattered here and there in Socialist literature, which raise the sus-

¹ *Essais Socialistes*, p. 116.

picion that a really triumphant Socialism, in some European countries, especially those in which the yoke of Rome had once been felt most heavily, might develop a fierce intolerance like that of the older orthodoxy. But these utterances are the rarest exceptions.

"Social Democracy," remarks Kautsky, "has not, and cannot have, any intention of oppressing the Churches. Her policy towards them must be the same as towards the bureaucracy and the army. She must demand, above all, the abolition of those privileges which raise the clergy above the rest of humanity."¹

Dr. Menger says (after discussing the hatred of Anarchists for the Churches)—

"Even among Socialists there are a few authors who demand that religion should be forcibly abolished.² The opposite view, that after the introduction of the new social order, religion will disappear of itself without force or violence, has found many exponents in Socialist literature."³

One of its ablest exponents, we may add, was the Viennese jurist himself. Socialists of his school await with calm satisfaction the decline and the gradual disappearance of the Churches of Christ on earth. "Individuals may or may not believe in the existence of God or in the future life," remarks M. Vandervelde, "but social life will organize itself outside of these ideas—without denying them and without affirming them."⁴ The Belgian leader says further—

"We consider it also to be an inflexible obligation, above all, for those whose example may have a decisive influence, not to present the demoralizing spectacle of an apparent acceptance of dogmas in which they do not believe. We can only repeat here

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 20.

² *Neue Staatslehre*, p. 206. He names especially Meslier and Weitling.

³ Among them are Engels and Bebel.

⁴ *Essais Socialistes*, p. 181.

what we have said in reference to the fight against alcoholism ; if we desire to prevent others from doing anything, let us begin by not doing it ourselves.”¹

Dr. Menger, in one of his books, compared the Divine Ruler of the world to the old Kings of the Franks, who had delegated so many of their functions to their Mayors of the Palace that at length they found themselves entirely superseded.

“If the democratic Work-State can succeed, without any application of force, in establishing the reign of an experimental philosophy in State and life,” says Dr. Menger, “one of the greatest, perhaps, indeed, the greatest of all the problems of history will be solved.”²

This learned writer did not quite agree with Marx in his materialistic conception of history, as we see from the following remarkable passage—

“The idea of Marx (and still more of Marxism) that the religious life is a mere result of economic conditions ; the suggestion which Engels, for example, made from this standpoint, that Calvin’s views on election by grace were the religious expression of the fact that in the world of trade and competition success or bankruptcy does not depend on the activity or the skill of the individual, but on conditions which are independent of himself—views like these approach very closely to the borders of the ridiculous. He who knows the history of Christianity is aware that every one of the more important utterances of Christ or the Apostles has had a far greater influence on the religious consciousness of Christians than the whole development of economics.”³

The “other worldliness” of the Churches is peculiarly obnoxious to Socialists. M. Vandervelde prefixes to the essay from which we have quoted a passage from Renan which perfectly represents the opinion of the newer Socialists of every school.

¹ *Essais Socialistes*, p. 168.

² *Neue Staatslehre*, p. 211.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 226, 227.

“If we think that everything will be restored in heaven, it is not worth while to seek for order and justice here below. Our own principle is that we must arrange this present life as if the future life had no existence; that it is never permissible to fall back on the life beyond in order to justify a social state or action. To be constantly making our appeal to the future life is to put to sleep the spirit of reform, to slacken zeal for the rational organization of humanity.”

CHAPTER XII

IS THERE A CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM?

INFLUENTIAL leaders of the Church of England, such as Maurice, Kingsley, Bishop Westcott, and, in the present day, Bishop Gore, Father Adderley and Canon Scott Holland, have been inspired by the idea of a Christian Socialism. Professor Lujo Brentano, Mr. C. F. G. Masterman, and Mr. Woodworth have written popular accounts of the movement. The subject has been investigated so fully and sympathetically by expert writers, the literature is so abundant and so easily accessible, that we may take it for granted that readers are acquainted with the general outline of the earlier facts. The most notable recent development within the Church of England has been the growth of the "Church Socialist League."

The impartial inquirer who, after studying the newest international Socialist literature, takes down from his shelves the books and pamphlets of English Christian Socialism, is at once aware that he has returned to the region of sober and gradual reform. He sees that many of his authors are veiling the objects of the average Liberal or Radical under the high-sounding phrases of Socialism. As Lord Hartington said to Mr. Gladstone at the close of a discussion on Home Rule, "We do not mean the same thing." The real comrades of these earnest Christian Socialists are men like M. Marc Sangnier and the Abbé Gay-

raud, who are inspired by a holy zeal for the welfare of the people and by an ardent attachment to the Christian faith, but who firmly repudiate the name and principles of Socialism.

I

Christian Social Reformers in France and England

For comparison with the views of these writers we may take Father Adderley's recently published booklet, *A Little Primer of Christian Socialism*.¹ The Vicar of Saltley has devoted his life to the poor in great cities, and the keynote of his ministry has been a severe self-denial, accompanied by the tenderest personal sympathy for the suffering members of his flock.

He says in his *Primer*—

41*

"The aim of Socialism is gradually to re-organize national industry on the basis of common State ownership of the means of production and distribution. This is not 'communism' or holding all things in common, nor is it making everybody equal. Socialism does not propose to abolish inequality, but to produce equity. Wages would still be paid, but they would be paid on a better system, according to the productive usefulness of each worker. 'Individuality' would not be destroyed. Men could soon rise to higher posts of management, direction, etc." ²

"We believe," says Mr. Adderley, "that the heart of the Eternal Father of Spirits yearns in love towards those whom He sees deprived of the means of a complete human life. We believe He so loved the world that He sent His Son to save it, and to make a new Heaven and a new Earth, in which Justice shall again reign supreme." ³

There is hardly a word in this pamphlet with which any Christian social reformer would disagree, though Mr.

¹ London : The Whitwell Press, Plaistow, E.

² *A Little Primer of Christian Socialism*, p. 80.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 15, 16.

Adderley belongs to the most advanced section of the "Christian Socialist" clergy.

"Socialism," he says, "would be a revolution, but not necessarily or probably a sudden one. It is unlikely that it will come from the labouring class only. It is more likely to come from the 'intellectual élite,' both capitalist and wage-earners, when they come to see that it is the best way."¹

Let us compare these passages with the views of Marc Sangnier, editor of *Le Sillon*, and of the Abbé Gayraud, whose work, *Les Démocrates Chrétiens*, is mentioned with respect even by non-Christian Socialists.

M. Sangnier, in his book entitled *The Fight for the Democracy*,² uses language quite as earnest as Mr. Adderley's, though he proclaims himself no Socialist. He insists that a personal moral reformation must be the primary condition of beneficial social changes, and takes as his motto the words: "Et in captivitatem redigentes omnem intellectum in obsequium Christi"³ (2 Cor. x. 5).

Socialism, he says, seeks to destroy individual initiative: "We want to see a larger number of men rising every day to the rank of master." Every capable worker is to have his chance. "We do not seek to destroy the authority of the employer, but, on the contrary, to allow an ever-growing number of workers share it."⁴

Would Father Adderley ask for more than this?

"Socialism," remarks M. Sangnier, "cannot boast that the future is with it, because its own successes are more exhausting than its defeats. Socialism has not, indeed, as a support in victory, that inner spring which the love of Christ puts into our hearts. It lacks that ferment of divine charity which prevents the true

¹ *A Little Primer of Christian Socialism*, p. 82. These views, as will be seen, are not shared by Kautsky.

² *La Lutte pour la Démocratie*. (Perrin et Cie.) 1907.

³ "Bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ."

⁴ *Op. cit.* p. 14.

Christian from letting himself be enslaved by the very social condition which he is determined to transform. Socialism will never know that super-earthly ideal which bends towards the daily realities of social life only that it may reform them according to the plan of eternal justice. It will always be tossed about between the foolish excesses of extremists and the refusals of the wise which look like betrayals; its very triumphs will do it more harm than its disasters. It has had, and will have, victories, no doubt; but they are the victories which kill.”¹

M. Sangnier is so keen a social reformer that he desires the workers to possess the means of production in common, but he agrees with M. Clemenceau that the hardest task for reformers is not that of creating a future city, like magicians who strike the earth with an enchanter's wand, but that of “making the men who will make the future city.”²

“As for the Socialists,” says Marc Sangnier, “we leave them far behind. Their dream lacks boldness. Since they imagine they can reform society without taking the trouble to reform the individual; since the only philosophy they profess is a doctrine of interest and selfishness; it is but too clear that, if their city is not to crumble into ruins, they will be forced to appeal to the severities of a legalized tyranny and the persecution of a triumphant bureaucracy. Their imagination lacks inventiveness. They are rebuilding the house with the oldest and most disused materials.”³

Although M. Sangnier writes thus frankly against Socialism, there are many passages in his book in which we seem to hear the voice of Father Adderley, of Dr. Clifford, of the Rev. J. T. Forbes. He declines to call himself by the misleading name of Socialist, but he is prepared to go farther, perhaps, in the people's cause than some of those who use it.

“Since Christ died on the Cross for the salvation of the world,” he writes, “a new element has been brought into play here on

¹ *La Lutte pour la Démocratie*, pp. 36, 37.

² *Ibid.* p. 68.

³ *Ibid.* p. 70.

earth, of which sociologists will have to take account. New possibilities of social brotherhood open themselves to the men who are born from above, and, as it were, under the new heaven of which the apostle speaks."¹

We may call attention further to the book of the Abbé Gayraud,² a modern Bishop von Ketteler, with a far more advanced programme than that of the Bishop of Mainz. We may safely say that there is not one reform for which our English "Christian Socialists" are pleading which has not the enthusiastic support of the Abbé, who yet declares himself no Socialist. To take one example only, he considers the "right to work" an inalienable privilege of every human being, since God has commanded men to live by the fruits of their labour. The social mission of the Church, in his view, is next in importance to its spiritual mission, and the party of the "Christian Democrats" stands for non-revolutionary but drastic reform. It may be safely said that the changes advocated by the Abbé Gayraud would alter the whole face of society, yet he declines to call himself a Socialist. Are not he and M. Sangnier wiser than some of our vague thinkers at home?

II

True Socialists on their Christian Socialist Allies

Socialists of the true Marxian school delight in drawing up codes which rule out the "Christian Socialists."

¹ *La Lutte pour la Démocratie*, p. 264. We may note in this connection some words of Georges Sorel in his preface to Merlino's book: "Si nous jugeons le socialisme chrétien incapable de résoudre la question sociale, c'est qu'il manque de cette notion de la catastrophe morale; c'est qu'il nie la nouvelle évaluation de toutes les valeurs." Writers on Christian Socialism, such as the Bishop of Birmingham and Father Adderley, would agree with Marc Sangnier that in Christianity alone is there a new valuation of all the values (2 Cor. v. 17).

² *Les Démocrates Chrétiens* (Victor Lecoffre).

Kautsky, for example, makes a clear distinction between "revolutionaries" and "reformers," and declines to take the latter seriously.¹

"The distinction between reform and revolution," writes Kautsky, "does not lie in the fact that in the one case force is to be used and in the other not. Every legal and political regulation is enforced by the power of the State."

Even special forms of the application of force, like street fights, do not of themselves, in Kautsky's view, constitute the essential element of a revolution as opposed to reform. The real point of distinction lies in the conquest of political power by a new class.

"Measures which aim at fitting the legal and political superstructure of society to altered economic conditions are reforms, if they are carried through by those classes who have hitherto held political and economic sway over the community; they are reforms even if they are not granted willingly, but are forced into being by the pressure of the subordinate classes or the power of circumstances. On the other hand, those measures are the outcome of a *revolution* that proceed from a class which has hitherto been economically and politically subordinated, and which has now won political power—a power which in its own interest it must necessarily use to transform, more or less rapidly, the entire political and legal superstructure and to create new forms of social co-operation."²

In other words, says Kautsky, a social revolution cannot possibly be reconciled with the interests of the classes which at present are called "the ruling classes." All those who seek to carry out even radical changes on the basis of the present social organization are mere *reformers*, who foolishly, as Kautsky argues, believe that the interests of the rich can be reconciled with those of the poor.

¹ See his pamphlet entitled, *Die Soziale Revolution*, pp. 8, 9. Second edition. Berlin. 1907. Buchhandlung Vorwärts.

² *Ibid.* p. 9.

How many Christian Socialists are prepared to accept Kautsky's definition of true Socialism? Is not the class-war which he proclaims antagonistic to the teachings of Christianity? And have not all the great leaders of Christian Socialism in our country believed that their schemes of reform could be carried out with the goodwill of the present owners of property?

M. Vandervelde has some instructive remarks on Catholic and Protestant forms of Socialism.

"It would be a dangerous delusion," he says, "to hope that by effecting a rigid separation between the spiritual and the temporal, we could establish a *modus vivendi* between Socialism and the Catholic Church."¹

He quotes the case of the well-known American Socialists, Thomas Hagerty and Father McGrady, both of whom found themselves compelled to abandon the priesthood. Writing in *Le Mouvement Socialiste* in 1903, the Abbé Hagerty remarked that no one would ask the butcher for a Catholic beefsteak, a Methodist cutlet, or a Presbyterian piece of veal. Religion, he claimed, has no more to do with Socialism than with meat or bread. Socialism is an economic science, not a metaphysical interpretation of the world. As M. Vandervelde says, the event proved that the Catholic Church permits no such closed compartments. Religion is a sociology, and the Pope has condemned Socialism.

M. Vandervelde expresses the hope that the vague aspirations of Christian Socialism may gain definiteness by contact with true collectivism. He writes sympathetically of the Protestant group represented in M. Wilfrid Monod's paper, *L'Avant-Garde*. "Each number of this

¹ *Essais Socialistes*, p. 116.

paper brings us fresh proof of the spread of Socialist ideas among a small but energetic and living section of the Protestant clergy." In Switzerland, Holland, Great Britain, and the United States Socialism finds support in Protestant circles, but its friends, in M. Vandervelde's opinion, are a mere fractional minority.

"The truth is that in all countries where there exists a national Protestant Church, the mass of those who belong to it, except in a merely nominal way, forms at the same time the bulk of the Conservative and anti-Socialist parties."¹

The Belgian leader sums up as follows—

"We certainly can feel nothing but sympathy for those whose sincere Christianity, set free from all ecclesiastical control, inclines them towards Socialist action. We should be lacking in tolerance if we took the offensive against religious groups whose 'kingdom is not of this world,' and who allow to their members complete liberty from the political and social point of view. But we are compelled to fight against those who carry the fight on to our territory, who make religion an instrument of temporal sovereignty and rule."²

III

A Note on Christian Socialism in Germany

Thirteen years have passed since Friedrich Naumann founded the German "National Social" party. In 1903 he was obliged to dissolve the organization, and to allow his followers to merge themselves with the Liberal groups. The name of Naumann is honoured far beyond Germany on account of the mystical beauty of his religious writings, and high hopes were formed for his success as a party leader. The history of the "National Socialists" may be

¹ *Essays Socialistes*, p. 143.

² *Ibid.* p. 153.

studied in the book recently published by Pastor Martin Wenck, to which Naumann contributed a preface.¹

Sorrowfully the leader confesses that there was "no place for a new party." He desired to reconcile Socialism, not only with the highest religious teaching, but with an ardent national patriotism. "It proved impossible," he writes, "to form a group distinct on the one hand from Social Democracy, and on the other from the Liberals."

Naumann maintains that his ideas are alive and are influencing political action, but he failed to make headway against the power of Social Democracy, and he admits that his followers numbered only a few thousands.

"He who wishes to influence his time," says Naumann, "must seek truth and must know how to wait. The seed corn is cast into the earth, that it may die and grow. Our Union is at an end, but the men who belonged to it are not crushed and despondent. In many places they are working on, and they know that the dawn of their hopes is already breaking on the sky of history."

¹ *Die Geschichte der Nationalsozialen*, von Martin Wenck, Pfarrer a.D. (formerly secretary of the party union). 1905. Buchverlag der *Hilfe*, Berlin.

CHAPTER XIII

THE PRESS UNDER SOCIALISM

THE question of the organization of the Press under a Socialist State is recognized as of supreme importance, but is discussed in the party literature much more rarely and more cautiously than the question of religion. The vague and hesitating language of constructive leaders who on most other points think clearly and definitely, is a sufficient indication of the perplexities which surround this subject. It is assumed by all Socialists that under their State the Press will be (1) free, and (2) a guardian of public morals; and having said thus much, many writers are inclined to drop a troublesome theme. Others launch forth into denunciations of the "Capitalist Press," which is said to be the willing servant of the rich in their oppression of the proletariat. It is assumed that when the eagle of the Socialist State mews her mighty youth, "the whole noise of timorous and flocking birds, with those also that love the twilight," will "flutter about, amazed at what she means, and in their envious gabble, prognosticate a year of sects and schisms." Socialism, according to M. Vandervelde, will introduce men to a larger freedom in every relation of life. Kautsky, in his recent essay, *The Morrow of the Social Revolution*, enumerates among the blessings of the new order, that of an emancipated Press.¹

¹ *Am Tage nach der sozialen Revolution.*

I

Constructive Socialists on the Future of the Press

We take some typical passages as illustrating Socialist views on the function and place of newspapers in their imagined State.

(a) *English Views*.—In the Fabian essay on “Industry under Socialism”¹ it is admitted that difficulties are likely to arise “in connection with the industries concerned in the production of such commodities as books and newspapers.”

“During the transitional stage these difficulties will not arise, but when all industries are carried on by the commune, or the nation, how will books and newspapers be produced? I only throw out the following suggestions. Printing, like baking, tailoring, shoemaking, is a communal rather than a national industry. Suppose we had printing offices controlled by the communal council. The printing committee might be left free to accept any publication it thought valuable, as a private firm to-day may take the risk of publication, the arrangement with the author being purchase outright, or royalty on copies sold, in each case so much to be put to his credit at the communal bank. But there are many authors whose goods are desired by no one; it would be absurd to force the community to publish all minor poetry. Why not accept the principle that in every case where the printing committee declines to print at the communal risk, the author may have his work printed by transferring from his credit at the communal bank to the account of the printing committee sufficient to cover the cost of printing? The committee should have no power to refuse to print where the cost was covered. . . . Newspapers might be issued on similar terms; and it would always be open to individuals, or to groups of individuals, to publish anything they pleased on covering the cost of publication. With the comparative affluence which would be enjoyed by each member of the community, any one who really cared to reach the public ear would be able to do so by diminishing his expenditure in other directions.”

¹ *Socialism*. Edited by G. Bernard Shaw, pp. 158, 159.

Does the Fabian Society seriously suppose that under Socialism any private citizen or group of citizens would be rich enough to undertake the expenditure involved in the creation of a newspaper under modern conditions? The calculations of the great constructive thinkers give no encouragement to such a dream. They promise modest comfort, but not overflowing wealth, to every citizen, and the rates of payment for labour, even presuming that a graduated and not an equal scale is adopted, would not admit of any piling up of capital.

Mr. H. G. Wells foresees that "the freedom of writing" may be impaired if the State becomes the universal publisher and distributor of books and newspapers.

"It is still open to the Anti-Socialist to allege that Socialism may incidentally destroy itself by choking the channels of its own thinking, and the Socialist has still to reply in vague general terms."¹

"The Socialist State," Mr. Wells remarks, "must certainly be a ubiquitous newsvendor and bookseller; the ordinary newsvendor and bookseller must become an impartial State official, working for a sure and comfortable salary instead of for precarious profits. And this amplification of the book and news post and the book and news trades will need to be not simply a municipal but a State service of the widest range."

This chapter, in which Mr. Wells discusses a subject on which he is peculiarly qualified to speak, does not include any definite or positive proposal.

"These are problems," he says, "which the Socialist has still to work out. . . . In all these issues of the intellectual life it is manifest that public ownership must be so contrived, and can be so contrived, as to avoid centralization and a control without alternatives. Moreover, whatever public publishing is done, it must be left open to any one to set up as an independent publisher or printer, and to sell and advertise through the impartial public book and

¹ *New Worlds for Old*, p. 293.

news distributing organization. . . . The problem of the Press is perhaps to be solved by some parallel combination of individual enterprise and public resources.”¹

Mr. Wells admits that Socialists have been “far too busy” to think out such questions.

(b) *A French View*.—M. Georges Renard has an interesting but vague chapter on the place of the Press under Socialism. He does not recognize, as Mr. Wells does, the tremendous difficulties which would beset the independent newspaper in a Socialist State. He says—

“The most effective weapon against all abuses, the surest means of defending the rights of citizens against the encroachments of power, is, or rather ought to be, the freedom of the Press. But we know only too well what the Press becomes in a society where money rules. The ‘fourth estate,’ which ought constantly to check and improve the three others, becomes, in the hands of unscrupulous persons, a formidable instrument of intimidation and extortion. Instead of being the organ of public opinion, the Press strives to make public opinion the humble slave of the financial leaders, to whom the Press itself is in bondage. . . . There are questions which a journalist cannot touch, truths which he has not the right to tell, dangers which it is not permissible for him to point out. What could have been more hateful than the silence of almost the entire Press at the time of the Armenian massacres? What more scandalous than the launching of these Russian loans which provide a despotic Government with the necessary means for crushing out revolution—at the expense of the French Savings Banks, which are put at the mercy of an almost inevitable bankruptcy?”²

M. Renard believes that the fall of capitalism will drag down the “servile Press which defends it,” and like Kautsky, he anticipates that the Press, under the Socialist State, will be “free” in the highest and noblest sense. He does not, however, face any of the practical difficulties.

¹ *New Worlds for Old*, pp. 298, 299.

² *Le Socialisme à l'Œuvre*, pp. 373, 374.

M. Deslinières devotes two pages to this question of the Press. In the Socialist State, he says, there will be an official Press and a free Press. "The free Press will be founded and developed under conditions infinitely more favourable than those of the present time. A publisher or a group of writers who wish to bring out a journal dealing with any kind of questions whatever, will apply to the national printing-works, to whom they will pay in advance the amount of the cost of printing a single issue in as many numbers as many be required. This price will represent the bare expense of printing, without including cost of matter. The printed copies will then be forwarded free of charge to the newsagents selected, and the sum obtained for the copies sold will be handed without deduction to the publisher."¹

(c) *A German View*.—Dr. Menger puts forth the curious idea that when religion has died out, the Press will be the chief guardian of morals.

"Among the lower classes," he remarks, "there is a continuously growing effort to make this earthly life richer and more satisfying from the sensuous and intellectual point of view. Socialism is the clearest expression of these widespread tendencies. But in this way the consciousness of the masses inevitably comes into conflict with the fundamental principle of Christianity as we have it to-day—the principle according to which our earthly life is only a transient pilgrimage, intended to lead towards and prepare us for the true goal of humanity, everlasting life in a supernatural world beyond the grave."²

Religion, he believed, is destined to lose its influence over men's minds, but with its disappearance he feared that the moral safeguards of society would be weakened, "as

¹ *L'Application du Système Collectiviste*, pp. 358–360. M. Deslinières thinks that under Socialism very little money will be needed to found a paper, but very great ability, because there will be none of "that manna on which papers are fed now-a-days: business and financial advertisements."

² *Neue Staatslehre*, p. 57.

they were weakened in the ancient world after the dissolution of the heathen religions." He observed along with the decay of faith, a markedly growing sensitiveness to public opinion, and—to put his proposal in a sentence—he wished the newspaper to become a kind of pillory, in which the wrongdoer would be exposed to shame before his fellow citizens. Good conduct was to be praised, bad conduct blamed, in the public Press, with a frankness hitherto unknown. Like M. Renard in *Socialism at Work*, Dr. Menger fulminated against the evils of our present Press, but he had never asked himself seriously how a free Press could exist in the bureaucratic Socialist State. He recognized that in the Press the Work-State would find ready to its hand an effective means for the promotion of morality, while at the same time the Press, unlike the Churches, would be independent of dogmatic belief.

"Two conditions are, however, indispensable. In the first place, the Press must, under certain conditions, be at the service of every one. At present only the most influential social groups are able to influence the action of their fellow-citizens through the newspapers. The second condition is that this guarantee for securing moral action shall be organized by public legislation."¹

Dr. Menger proposes that the State should publish independently-produced official papers for different localities. Every citizen would have a right to complain in these journals of wrong actions which affected the welfare of the whole community, and an injured person might use them also to defend himself in private quarrels. Entertaining as is this scheme for a daily or weekly "Socialist pillory," Dr. Menger's general references to the Press are disappointing. He can have known little of practical journalism.

We have not been able to discover, in the entire range

¹ *Neue Staatslehre*, p. 58.

of the party literature, any coherent examination of the question, Could the Socialist State afford to tolerate a free Press?

II

Would Independent Journalism be Possible under Socialism ?

1. *The Free Field.*—Students of Socialist literature will gladly admit that, within certain limits, freedom of the Press, as we understand it, might be possible under a Socialist State. Some of the party writers assure us that there is no need to fear a cessation of the glorious contests of politics, since human nature delights in such honourable warfare; and as opposing wind-currents refresh the air, so the air of public life must still be purified by the contrary breezes of “Ins” and “Outs.” Independent newspapers might be founded, we take it, by individuals or by groups, who cared to save up surplus earnings for the purpose; and it would be permissible for such journals to criticize details of administration. It might even be advantageous for the Socialist State to subsidize party organs of more than one complexion, provided that the criticism in such papers were kept within due bounds. Mermeix, the one writer who has touched on this subject from the impartial standpoint, considers that the disappearance of advertising would destroy all possibility of an independent journalism.

“Collectivism,” he says, “makes the newspaper business impossible, because it suppresses advertisements. There would be no longer any need of advertisement, because commerce and commercial competition would have disappeared. Now we know that the chief revenue of the Press is derived from these public announcements. When this legitimate resource has vanished, there will be no money left to pay foreign correspondents, or to

pay for telegrams; nothing for the editors' salaries or even for the paper-maker's bills. The Press, under a Socialist government, could publish nothing beyond the official dispatches which were forwarded to it by 'the Society.' The government would rule the public mind."¹

Writers like Mr. H. G. Wells have a glimmering of this danger when they prepare for a continuance of the advertising system: county competing against county, and country against country (under a supposed internationalism) for the production of the best goods. Briefly, it may be said that the Socialist pressman who now writes in peace and freedom, expects that under the Socialist State, also, he will be allowed to speak his mind.

2. *Beyond the Barrier*.—"Freedom of thought," says Mermeix, "will be perfect under Socialism; there can be no doubt of that." The Spanish Inquisition itself could not have prevented men from thinking as they pleased in the deep of the heart. But liberty to express one's thought would be hindered under Socialism, the French writer suggests, by a censorship from above and from below. A Socialist compositor, according to Mermeix, would have the right to refuse to set up any book or newspaper article which seemed to him to contain principles inconsistent with those of the Socialist State. The State itself could not allow its fundamental doctrines to be attacked by rebels.

We take one example from the many possible difficulties that might occur. Karl Kautsky, as is well known, considers that the tremendous financial burdens which must fall upon the Socialist State would prevent any substantial increase of wages at the present rates of production. He therefore advocates an adaptation of the American trust

¹ *Le Socialisme*, pp. 297, 298.

system, under which all small businesses would be abolished and the workers in each trade would be concentrated in huge factories, where machinery would be so speeded up as to increase the scale of production while diminishing the hours of labour.¹

Let us suppose that the Socialist State had adopted such a system, which would involve a vast migration of workers, and would prevent the working-man from having any sure or fixed abode in his native country. Let us suppose, further, that a group of citizens were so dissatisfied with this regulation that they decided to find capital amongst them for the establishment of a paper which would fight against the Socialist "Trust" industries. Suppose that the paper were conducted with such ability, such passion and conviction, that it won a firm and increasing hold on the masses. Could the State afford to tolerate such a paper? Must not its proprietors be treated as rebels? This is no fanciful picture, for if an eminent leader like Kautsky admits, on the one hand, that new methods and rates of production are the essential condition of an increase of wages, we may be certain, on the other hand, that the masses of workers would never accept Socialism unless some material improvement of their lot were promised. The State must organize itself on the plan which offered to the workers most money ² and most comfort. Could it allow any journalist to criticize its primary provisions for peace and order?

"The State, being the only printer, might refuse," says Mermeix, "to allow the use of its presses to anti-Socialist newspapers, to Conservative journals which might seek to undo the Revolution, as well as to anarchical, too-Socialist papers, which

¹ *Am Tage nach der sozialen Revolution.*

² The old Socialist idea of "labour-certificates" instead of money is practically abandoned, even by Marxians.

THE PRESS UNDER SOCIALISM 153

might think the Revolution incomplete. Papers, as well as books, would be under the censorship. The people would read nothing except by permission of the Government.”¹

Have Socialists any clear reply to such arguments?

¹ *Le Socialisme*, p. 298

CHAPTER XIV

PATRIOTISM, ARMAMENTS, AND FOREIGN POLICY

THE authors of the Communist Manifesto taught that the working-man has no fatherland, for in none is he a son. He is, in their view, a nomad of society, doomed to a life hardly more secure, though far more burdensome, than that of the tramp or gipsy. His true interest, according to Marx, lies in the knitting of ties with men of his own class in all nations, rather than in any zeal or affection for the country in which he is born. As Bernstein points out, the lot of the proletariat has greatly improved since the time of Marx and Engels, and most of the newer Socialists repudiate the unpatriotic teachings of the Manifesto. Still more earnestly do they repudiate the doctrine of the Anarchist leader Bakunin that "patriotism is an evil, a narrow and a fatal custom, because it is the negation of human equality and solidarity."

"The social question, as it is put forward to-day by the working-class world of Europe and America—a question which can only be solved by the abolition of State frontiers—tends inevitably," wrote Bakunin, "to destroy that traditional habit in the minds of the workers of all countries."

Werner Sombart remarks on this passage: "I think there is hardly a Socialist of any standing to-day whose thoughts or feelings move in this direction."¹

¹ *Sozialismus und Soziale Bewegung*, p. 223.

I

The New Socialists on Patriotism

A writer who approaches most closely to the old position is Menger, who argues (1) that patriotism, far from being a deeply-rooted emotion of man's nature, is an artificial and temporary growth, which varies with the course of political events; and (2) that we find it developed chiefly among the rich.

"Patriotism," he says, "is naturally most developed among those classes of the population who live on the first-floor of the State building—the nobility, the clergy, the army, and the office-holders. These classes are almost always closely associated with the rulers, and their existence, in greater or less degree, depends upon that association. Therefore patriotism with them consists in devotion to the ruler, while sympathy for country and people falls more into the background. This faithfulness to the ruler, which depends upon a common interest, often lasts on after the loss of the throne. . . . In the middle classes patriotism consists chiefly in the feeling for land and people, while the person of the ruler, so long as religion and nationality remain undisturbed, is a matter of comparative indifference to them."¹

As for the poor, Dr. Menger agrees with Marx that patriotism cannot be expected from them. They are too closely occupied with the pettiest economic cares to have time or thought to spare for larger questions.

"The State itself, for which these classes of the people are supposed to sacrifice themselves, has, for thousands of years, merely made demands upon them, and has not given them anything. Only a few decades have passed since the State began to trouble itself at all about the economic fate of the poor. And war, in which the activity of the patriotic military State finds its highest expression, divides its gifts with as much partiality as peace. While the lucky general, whose victory has often been flung into

¹ *Neue Staatslehre*, p. 36.

his lap by chance, attains the position of an almost superhuman hero, and while rich honours and privileges fall to the lot of even the subordinate officers; the rank and file, although they make the most cruel sacrifices in war, must—if only on account of their larger numbers—renounce the hope of any reward. The natural result of such a state of things is that the patriotism of the poorer classes of the population in our present State is comparatively small.”¹

Is not the truth about the patriotism of the poorest classes in all countries expressed by Sir Walter Scott in that brief conversation between the Antiquary and Edie Ochiltree, after it was rumoured that the French were to land near Fairport?

“I would not have thought you, Edie, had so much to fight for?”

“*Me* no muckle to fight for, sir?—isna there the country to fight for, and the burnsidies that I gang daundering beside, and the hearths o’ the gude-wives that gie me my bit bread, and the bits o’ weans that come toddling to play wi’ me when I come about a landward toun?” . . .

“Bravo, bravo, Edie! The country’s in little ultimate danger, when the beggar’s as ready to fight for his dish as the laird for his land.”

Socialists of the more moderate type recognize the futility of Menger’s argument that the State has no gifts or privileges even for the humblest of her children.

Bernstein considers that the political rights conferred on the working classes have made it impossible that national interests should be indifferent to them.

“If social democracy is not yet in power, it has already a position of influence which carries certain obligations. Its word weighs very heavily in the scale.”²

The anti-patriotic teachings of Hervé have found support only in the Syndicalist school. They are opposed by

¹ *Neue Staatslehre*, pp. 36, 37.

² *Die Voraussetzungen des Sozialismus*, p. 145.

such leaders as Bebel and Jaurès. Georges Renard, in his *Letter to Soldiers*,¹ takes a precisely opposite line from that of Hervé. We Socialists, he says, are the enemies of militarism, but we are none the less patriotic Frenchmen.

"We hate militarism, because it kills liberty, because it spills the blood and scatters the money of nations, because it awakes and keeps alive the savage instincts of primitive humanity, because it flings away on training for the hideous art of mutual murder an immense sum of energy and intelligence which we should prefer to see used for the amelioration and not for the destruction of life upon earth. It is our hope, our faith, our certainty, that militarism will disappear as slavery has lately disappeared."²

None the less, he continues, Socialists love their country and are resolved to keep it strong against the world.

"We cannot treat the present as if we lived in a more or less distant future. . . . Every nation is threatened by its neighbours; it cannot, save at the risk of suicide, leave itself undefended; it is obliged to stand erect and armed. A military organization is therefore a temporary evil, as we hope, but a necessary evil. . . . We shall not advise a strike of soldiers."

Renard combats the teaching of Tolstoy on the soldier's duty.

"Tolstoy, with the approval of the Anarchists and a small number of our own comrades, has said, though vainly, to young men who are called to the colours, 'Refuse to obey, allow yourselves to be punished, imprisoned, struck, even killed; but refuse to learn to kill: the Gospel forbids it.' . . . We repudiate, with the immense majority of the Socialist Party, the idea of that passive revolt of the individual, and we do so for many reasons."³

The chief reason given by M. Renard is that of the vital interest of the fatherland.

"It may be that our native country will some day be merged in humanity, as the ancient provinces (Brittany, Artois, Gascony,

¹ *Lettre aux Militaires*. (Giard et Brière.)

² *Ibid.* pp. 3, 4.

³ *Ibid* p. 5.

etc.) were merged in the unity of France. But a man does not pull down his house on the pretext that he will some day possess a larger and finer one."

Moderately-minded Socialist writers would agree with Renard and Bernstein that nationalities are likely to continue for generations to come, even if Socialism triumphs; and some of the most eloquent of recent appeals to patriotic sentiment may be found in Socialist writings.

Compare this passage of Renard, for instance, with the paragraph quoted above from Menger—

"'Fatherland' is not an empty word, an abstract conception. It represents the country in which we were born, where we grew up, where we awoke to thought, to life. However good may be our reasons for proclaiming ourselves cosmopolitans, we cling none the less with the tenderest fibres of our hearts to the places which saw our childhood, to the things which at first were all our universe. And the fatherland is not only the larger birthplace; it represents, besides, a common fund of interests, traditions, hopes, a closer relationship between souls and even bodies."

"Socialists," he continues, "do not seek to suppress patriotism, but only to transform it."¹

II

The Army under a Socialist State

While Socialists dream of a universal and simultaneous disarmament in the distant future, they do not, with rare exceptions, advise any separate State to lay down its weapons and expose itself unprotected to the world. Neither do they wish to shake the discipline of armies.

"The refusal to fight," says Renard, "is, in critical circumstances, the negation of the most elementary social duty." It is like the flight of a fraudulent debtor, it

¹ *Lettre aux Militaires* (Giard et Brière), p. 6.

amounts to a civic death. The disciples of Tolstoy are compared by Renard to the *francs-fleurs* who slipped across the frontier while France was in the agony of the war of 1870, because they were too cowardly to face the risks of battle.

"Like all other citizens, Socialists are obliged to submit to the conditions of the world in which chance has given them birth, and all they can do is to mitigate the worst features of an institution which can disappear only with the disappearance of the violent and organized antagonisms of our society."¹

The Socialist State would arm all citizens.

True Marxians such as Kautsky are none the less true patriots. Kautsky proclaims himself the foe of militarism; and he proposes to carry out his principles in two ways: *first*, by arming the people; *second*, by a diminution of military expenditure. He says on these points—

"The arming of the people is a political necessity; reduction of armaments is a financial necessity."² He is aware that a universal military training is likely to swallow up as much money as a standing army, but the Socialist State, in the hour of victory, must be prepared to meet its old enemies in the gate, and if the defeated capitalists have the army on their side, Socialism must put weapons in the hands of the conquering proletariat. He argues throughout from the standpoint of State needs.³ He

¹ *Lettre aux Militaires*, p. 9.

² *Die soziale Revolution*, p. 70.

³ Thus Kautsky writes: "Nehmen wir also an, der schöne Tag sei angebrochen, der dem Proletariat mit einem Male alle Gewalt in den Schoß wirft. Was wird es damit anfangen? Nicht anfangen *wollen*, auf Grund dieser oder jener Theorie oder Stimmung, sondern anfangen *müssen*, getrieben durch seine Klasseninteressen und den Zwang der ökonomischen Nothwendigkeit."—"Let us assume that the fair day has dawned which will throw all power at once into the lap of the proletariat. How will they set about using it? I do not ask how they might *wish* to use it, on the basis of this or that theory or inclination, but how they will be *forced* to use it, impelled by their class interests and by the pressure of economic necessity."—*Die soziale Revolution*, p. 69.

wishes to reduce the army budget, but does not propose to replace the giant standing armies of the Continent by small paid armies recruited from the least desirable classes of the population. If we abolish conscription, says Kautsky, we must arm the whole body of the citizens.¹

Socialist leaders recognize that the citizens of their imagined State must be able to resist rebellion at home as well as attack from without. They are prepared for a heavy military expenditure. Mermeix writes—

“If Socialists seek to destroy the present army, . . . they mean to put a militia in its place. All the citizens will be soldiers; but the soldiers will not be less expensive because they are citizens. Perhaps they will be more expensive. As many weapons and officers will be required as in our present armies. Even if these officers have been elected—even if they exercise their command under the control of their subordinates, their salaries will have to be paid, for they cannot be present at the manoeuvres and at the same time be occupied in the workshop. Would it be fair to pay the men less when they were serving their country than when they were occupied in production? Will they not be producing safety, without which the other workers could not produce anything? The army expenses would therefore be very slightly reduced—possibly they might be increased—under Socialist rule.”²

Mermeix remarks that the anti-patriotic Socialist will find his occupation gone under the Socialist State, because it will be the interest of every citizen to make his country rich and strong.³

German Socialists have proved themselves in the main a patriotic party. One of the ablest pieces of Socialist writing of the last ten years is Bernstein's chapter, “The Immediate Tasks of the Social Democracy.”⁴ The motto of this chapter is a line from Schiller's *Maria Stuart*,⁵ originally

¹ *Die soziale Revolution*, p. 70.

² *Le Socialisme*, p. 286.

³ He says, for instance: “*M. Hervé lui-même cessera d'être hervétiste*,” p. 286.

⁴ *Die Voraussetzungen des Sozialismus*, p. 140-167.

⁵ Act I, last line of Scene 7.

spoken by the infuriated Queen of Scots to Lord Burleigh, in reference to her hated rival, Queen Elizabeth, but employed by Bernstein as the true watchword for modern Socialism—

“Und was sie *ist*, das wage sie zu scheinen.”
 (“Let her dare to appear as what she is.”)

As Prof. Karl Diehl remarks, the choice of this motto is a significant indication of the trend of Socialism in Germany. Bernstein and his school are, in home affairs, a party of advanced Social Reformers; in foreign affairs, a party of peace-loving, but patriotic nationalists.

The working-man, Bernstein says, is gaining, or has gained, the full rights of citizenship.

“The worker who possesses full electoral rights in State, commune, etc., and who has thus his share in the common property of the nation—whose children are educated, whose health is guarded by the community, and whom the community insures against misfortune, will have a fatherland, without ceasing to be a citizen of the world—as the nations draw nearer to each other, without yielding up anything of their own special life. It might seem a very convenient thing that all men should some day speak the same language. But what a charm, what a source of intellectual enjoyment would be lost in that case for the men of the future. The complete dissolution of nations is not a beautiful dream.¹

III

Socialist Foreign Policy

Students of the newer Socialism will find that an earnest desire for peace runs through that section of the party literature which treats of foreign affairs. The same laws of righteousness and brotherhood which prevail between in-

¹ *Die Voraussetzungen des Sozialismus*, p. 144.

dividuals ought, it is argued, to guide the conduct of nations. The diplomacy of the capitalist State is condemned as secret, tricky, full of subterfuges and evasions, inconsistent with genuinely democratic government. Foreign policy, say the Socialists, is carried on in a mysterious half-light, and the representatives of the people fail to penetrate its shady recesses. Even in the most democratic countries, arrangements of vital consequence are concluded without reference to Parliament, and the will of the nation may be thwarted by an autocratic Minister. Socialists maintain that their State, while bearing the burden of a costly militia, would yet be no menace to any neighbour. Their confidence in this respect can be understood only when we realize that their true goal is internationalism.

CHAPTER XV

THE DREAM OF INTERNATIONALISM

DR. FLINT, in his chapter on "Socialism and Morality," admits that the Socialists have done good by helping towards the diffusion of international or cosmopolitan feeling, and by convincing the workmen of different nations that they have common interests.

"Socialism," he says, "simply through awakening workmen to a sense of their interest over all the civilized world, has doubtless also helped them in some measure towards a true appreciation of the brotherhood of mankind. And it must be added, Socialism has further directly inculcated human fraternity. It has explicitly proclaimed universal brotherhood, the love of man as man, irrespective of race, country, and religion." ¹

The "Fundamental Pact" of the International Workmen's Association, drawn up by Marx in 1864, declares that the emancipation of labour is "neither a local, nor a national, but a social problem, which comprises all countries in which the modern state of society exists."

Rodbertus remarked that the social question is, in a sense, international, simply because it is social. Heine's saying is true of Socialism: "There are no longer nations in Europe, but only parties." Mr. Keir Hardie claims that, whatever differences there may be in the International Socialist movement concerning tactics, there is perfect agreement on two leading points of principle: (1) hostility

¹ *Socialism*, p. 393.

to militarism in all its forms, and (2) the determination to substitute public for private ownership and control of land and capital.¹

The most striking recent demonstration of the international aspects of Socialism was the scene at the funeral of Liebknecht, in August 1900. Kurt Eisner, in his short biography of the German leader, says that "the world followed him" through the streets of Berlin on that hot Sunday afternoon.

"It was a procession of love, mighty through its numbers, its earnestness, its simplicity. Representatives of the proletariat had come from every country in Europe. Two poor weavers from Lille had their place in the procession. They had travelled day and night, and had hastened at once from the railway station to the house of mourning. Though tired to death, they marched with the others during those long five and a half hours through the whole gigantic city of Berlin. They were overwhelmed with dust and heat, but no persuasion could induce them to get into a carriage. When the day was declining we reached the solemn peace of the green cemetery. Softly sounded the mournful strains of Chopin's funeral march. A dream-world unfolded itself before us. We wandered as if spellbound along that never-ending magic street full of flower-wreaths and scarlet bows. The evening sun lit up their golden inscriptions, and the eyes of all were shining."²

I

The Newer Socialists on Internationalism

Almost every recent Socialist book has a chapter on Internationalism. "The banner of Socialism," says a Russian leader, "is becoming more and more the banner of the working classes throughout the world."³

¹ *From Serfdom to Socialism*, p. 95.

² Wilhelm Liebknecht. *Buchhandlung Vorwärts*, p. 104. (Berlin. 1906.)

³ We quote these words from the remarkable book of Dr. Michael Tugan-Baranowsky, of St Petersburg: "Der moderne Sozialismus in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung." (Dresden: O. V. Böhmert, 1908.)

Kautsky remarks—

“More and more we see the disappearance or the last relics of national exclusiveness and national hatred, which the proletariat inherited from the bourgeoisie. The working classes are freeing themselves more and more from national prejudices ; the worker is increasingly coming to recognize and appreciate the foreign brother in labour (no matter what language he may speak) as a brother in warfare, as a comrade.”¹

The consciousness of international solidarity, it may be remarked, is growing without, as well as within, the ranks of Social Democracy. The parties of working-men who visit London every summer from different Continental countries are by no means all Socialists. Kautsky says very truly that at the time when the armaments of Europe are most formidable, when each of the military nations is like an armed camp, and when the rivalry in sea power entails the costliest burdens, we have a more cheering spectacle in the bridging over of the gulf between the workers of every land. “Internationalism,” remarks Werner Sombart, “is the root-principle on which the Socialist movement rests to-day.”

It is claimed by Socialist writers that internationalism must continue to develop within their ranks, alike for practical and sentimental reasons.

(a) The common interests of the rank and file require it.

“The workers of all civilized nations,” writes Werner Sombart, “so far as they have been drawn into the stream of the Socialist movement, are filled with the same spirit of internationalism.”² The reason given for this is that they are fighting against the same great enemy—Capitalism.

“Because capitalism rules in all modern civilized countries, and

¹ *Das Erfurter Programm*, p. 249.

² *Sozialismus und Soziale Bewegung*, p. 213.

because the proletariat everywhere has entered on an opposing movement and thus finds itself everywhere in the same position, therefore the working classes seek to give each other mutual support in the common struggle.”¹

The methods of support include, according to Werner Sombart, (1) the spread of information about the work accomplished; (2) common political action in securing from governments such measures as shall benefit the workers; and (3) gifts of money for the aid of strikers.

(b) “Our internationalism,” say the Socialists also, “is not only a matter of the intellect, but of the heart.” They love to quote Schiller’s words in the *Ode to Joy*: “O ye millions, we embrace you.”² In the dream of common action for the attainment of political and economic ends they see the promise of a universal brotherhood. Their favourite songs have all a cosmopolitan spirit.

At the Paris Congress of 1900, Jaurès opened the proceedings with a passionate appeal for common action among the delegates. He declared that a movement for the concentration of capital and for the sharpening of race-hatreds among the masses was promoted and encouraged by those who had everything to dread from Socialism.

The resolution against militarism which was adopted by the Paris Congress was long and vehemently worded. At Amsterdam in 1904 the Congress, by a resolution, summoned “the Socialists and workers of all lands to be the guardians of peace, and to oppose with all their might any further extension of war.”

At Stuttgart (1907) where the proceedings were far from harmonious, the trouble arose because the small

¹ *Sozialismus und Soziale Bewegung*, p. 214.

² “Seid umschlungen, Millionen,
Diesen Kuss der ganzen Welt !”

minority of Hervéists wished to carry the spirit of internationalism to a limit beyond that which the sober leaders could approve. They advocated a general strike of soldiers, and desertion in face of the enemy; in other words, a Tolstoyan internationalism. The defeat of such tactics was a significant answer to critics who believe, with Dr. John Rae, that the Socialist, almost by necessity of his position and principles, is predisposed to discourage and condemn patriotism.

"Internationalism," says M. Renard, "is not a synonym for anti-patriotism. The end which Socialists are seeking to attain is not the disappearance of national unities: it is the grouping of nations in great peaceful federations, which shall gradually draw closer so as to embrace the whole civilized world; it is the gradual elaboration of international laws which shall organize humanity, as State laws have organized nations. But that great structure which we wish to build—vast enough to contain the whole human race—will have nations as its pillars: it will rest upon their strong foundations, which have been cemented by the labours of ages, and whose destruction would bring about its own ruin."¹

II

Is Internationalism a Necessary Condition of Socialist Success?

Critics of Socialism have looked behind the glowing resolutions of Congresses, and the vague aspirations of such writers as Menger and Renard. They can appreciate, with Dr. Flint, the grandeur of a dream which places all workers under the red flag of the democratic work-State. Prof. Maurice Bourguin, the most learned anti-Socialist writer whom France has produced within the last ten years, repudiates the old selfish individualism in lan-

¹ *Le Socialisme à l'Œuvre*, p. 383.

guage which may be compared with that of Mr. St. Loe Strachey in the *Spectator*. "For the man of heart who is oppressed by the ever-present spectacle of misery, is there any nobler dream," he asks, "than that of happiness for all? What advantages would he not gladly relinquish, if he believed that the ransom of suffering humanity might be paid at such a price? Would he not even go as far as to sacrifice something of his freedom? There is no doubt that if Socialism is to be the salvation of the wretched, our choice spirits will go towards Socialism, without any thought of the personal loss which such action may involve for them."¹

But, as Maurice Bourguin reminds us, scientific students cannot be satisfied with the merely negative side of Socialism. They must demand an answer to those definite questions which were so persistently evaded by Marx and Engels. Critics are asking whether any Socialism at all would be possible unless it were based on internationalism. They try to imagine the position of a country which had adopted—as the result of a General Election—the principles of "Social Democracy." Would not such a country, they ask, be instantly delivered over to the will of its enemies? Kautsky's plan for the arming of all citizens might be workable in countries where conscription is in force, but how would it work in Britain or in the United States? Would not a new militarism of the most stringent type be the condition for them of national security? Socialists condemn our costly armaments, and a Socialist victory carries with it in the minds of some of their leaders a practical disarmament. If Socialism to such men as Mr. Keir

¹ *Les Systèmes socialistes et l'Évolution économique*, par Maurice Bourguin, Professeur adjoint à la Faculté de Droit de l'Université de Paris. Preface, p. 1 (Librairie Armand Colin, Paris. 3rd edition. 1907.)

Hardie means anything, it means, "Die Waffen nieder!" —Lay down your arms! Suppose, then, that one European country had accepted Socialism. That country in undergoing the incalculable transition from the present state of society to a pure collectivism, would be exposed with naked breast to the swords of all its enemies—unless these enemies had simultaneously accepted the same great change. The impartial student cannot conceive of any triumphant Socialism which is not adopted, at the same moment, by all the peoples. Take, as one example, the question of private property. The capitalist, foreseeing a revolution, will naturally wish to invest his money in foreign securities, and while the preliminary legislation for the Socialist State is proceeding, he will be able to slip across the borders with his property. Internationalism is essential if the rich man is to be forced to echo the ancient cry: "The barbarians drive us to the sea, and the sea flings us back upon the swords of the barbarians." To the impartial reader, the instinct of Socialists towards international relationships is the natural instinct of self-preservation.

Lucien Deslinières discusses the position of a State which adopted Socialism while its neighbours had not yet abandoned the Capitalist system. "Let us suppose," he says, "that France, as the first of the nations to adopt Collectivist institutions, was menaced by a new Holy Alliance on the part of the Capitalist world." He goes on—

"This eventuality does not appear to involve much danger, for although the day of enfranchisement seems near to us, we shall be forced, unhappily, to wait for it long enough to allow neighbouring countries time, if not to liberate themselves entirely, at least to make such progress in that direction that only slight efforts will be necessary for the final attainment of the goal. At that

moment Collectivist ideas will be represented in Germany, in England, in Belgium and doubtless in several other European nations by powerful, intelligent and well-organized minorities who would be ready to undertake the government on the day when a fortunate event made this possible. We can hardly suppose that the tremendous shock given to the old world by the adoption of Collectivism in France would not suffice, in these more important nations, to drive the ruling classes out of power. If, however, these classes were to resist that shock for some time longer, they would be so weakened that it would be impossible for them to undertake anything against France. At the first attempt made by them to raise an army and to march against us, the Capitalists, who held the control, would see a great many of their own bayonets turned against them. Do not let us forget that modern armies are no longer bands of adventurers, of *condottieri* ready for every task. They are a part of the nation. . . . A declaration of war against France, under the conditions we have pointed out, would not only become, for the imprudent Governments who dared to launch it, the signal, on their own soil, for a civil war in the streets; it would be also the signal for a civil war in the barracks.”¹

M. Deslinières does not propose to leave his country undefended in the event of its adopting Socialism. France, according to his advice, must make it known to the world that she would not undertake any offensive war. On the other hand, “she must carefully maintain her Army and her Navy till the day comes when the brotherly union of liberated nations would make it possible for all to remove that crushing burden.”²

M. Deslinières is one of the few Socialist writers who touch on the problem of the “yellow peril.” He believes that the Germanic and Latin nations will continue to rule the world, and will be able some day, with the aid of America, to insist upon the disarmament of the yellow races.

a ¹ *L'Application du Système Collectiviste*, pp. 380, 381.

² *Ibid.* p. 382.

CHAPTER XVI

AT THE GRAVE OF KARL MARX

ON an April afternoon of last year, the writer stood for the first time beside the grave of Karl Marx in Highgate Cemetery. Visitors might naturally expect to find his resting-place among the older and statelier monuments, but the pilgrims from all parts of the world, who inquire of the custodians where the Socialist prophet is buried, are directed to turn to the right at the top of Swain's Lane, and to search amid the white stones of the undistinguished dead.

The place allotted to Karl Marx in these "halls and gardens of the sleeping" is marked by a recumbent slab with a small headpiece. The inscription is as follows—

"JENNY VON WESTPHALEN,

The beloved wife of

KARL MARX,

Born 12th February, 1814,

Died 2nd December, 1881,

And KARL MARX,

Born May 5th, 1818,

Died March 14th, 1883."

Two names follow, one that of a little grandson who died at the age of five. The other is that of Helene

Demuth, the faithful, devoted servant of the Marx family, the "Lenchen" of Liebknecht's memoirs. She survived her mistress nine years. Liebknecht reminds us that the little son Edgar, known by the pet name of "Musch," sleeps under the pavement of Whitefield's Tabernacle in the Tottenham Court Road, and he thinks that the other two children who died in infancy were also buried there. The death of Edgar was a shattering blow for Marx. Liebknecht recalls the agonizing scene, when he drove with his friend towards Whitefield's. Marx sat in silence, his face hidden in his hands.

"I stroked his forehead. 'Mohr,¹ you have your wife, the girls and us—and we all love you so much!' 'You cannot give me back the boy,' he said, and in silence we drove on towards the burial-place in Tottenham Court Road. . . . When the coffin was lowered into the grave, Marx was so deeply moved that I placed myself beside him, because I feared that he might leap into the grave after it. Thirty years later, when the faithful partner of his life was laid to rest in Highgate Cemetery (and with her the half of his own personality, his own life)—he would have fallen into the grave had not Engels—who told me the facts later—caught him hastily by the arm."²

Frau Marx, with her lofty ideals and serene dignity of character, was the good angel, not only of her husband, but of the young Socialist exiles whom she admitted to her family circle. Liebknecht, writing four years before he died, confessed that but for her pure influence he might have been wrecked morally and spiritually during his years of struggle and penury in London. When this noble woman died, Engels said, "Then Mohr is dead too."

¹ The name given to Marx by his familiar friends.

² *Karl Marx zum Gedächtniss*, pp. 74, 75.

Fifteen months later Marx followed her to the tomb. We cannot read Liebknecht's brief memorial tribute without realizing how profound was his regard for both husband and wife. He remembered how they had borne the full bitterness of the exile's lot. "Few exiles," he says, "can have suffered more than Marx and his family. . . . For years—and in those years the worst was already past—the pound a week which Marx earned for his articles in the *New York Tribune* was his only secure source of income."¹

Liebknecht tells how Marx would never tolerate a loose jest or song in the presence of women or children, and how a disapproving glance from Frau Marx was more dreaded by the young exiles than the sharpest reproof. He tells of the joyous picnics on Hampstead Heath, of holidays spent in innocent mirth, of his own romps with the children. Though he differed from Marx from time to time on tactical questions, Liebknecht remained conscious to the last of the deep debt he owed to his earliest London friends.

On the day of the writer's visit, a wreath of glass-covered flowers was at the foot of the grave, its stiffness contrasting with the freshness of daffodils and hyacinths near by, and with the two small plain evergreen shrubs beside it. The real memorial to Marx was the wreath of immortelles which had been placed here by Russian comrades on the anniversary of his death, and which in its drenched and dilapidated condition, after the soakings of wild spring nights, had been laid on the path beside the grave, ready for removal to the waste-cart. The wreath was bound by a long piece of red ribbon, now dimmed and rain-washed, and on it we could read, after the Russian script, the

¹ *Karl Marx zum Gedächtnis*, p. 99.

words: "In Memoriam, March 14th." A young tree, in fragile April beauty, bent close to the tomb.

At the time of his death the name of Karl Marx was little known to English readers. The *Times* of Saturday, March 17, 1883, contained a brief paragraph about him at the head of its obituary notices: "Our Paris correspondent informs us of the death of Dr. Karl Marx, which occurred last Wednesday in London. . . . He wrote pamphlets on various subjects, but his chief work was *Le Capital*, an attack on the whole capitalist system. For some time he had been suffering from weak health."

Twenty-five years have passed since the funeral of March 1883, and the name of Marx has become one of the master-words of modern politics. If decay has done its work in the physical sphere, Goethe's maxim, "Stirb und werde," is true of his real personality. Strange, revivifying forces have been at work, not with the poor mortal dust, but with his spiritual legacy. Professors in French, German, Bohemian, Austrian, Italian and Russian universities have felt it an honour to expound his writings. A learned Russian Socialist, Dr. Michael Tugan-Baranowsky, says—

"In order to gain influence over the masses, Socialism had to come nearer to the daily interests of the masses. This task has been fulfilled by Marxism. Owing to the tactics devised by the genius of Marx, the Socialist movement became a workers' movement. The fight for the Socialist ideal has taken the character of a fight for the improvement of the lot of the working classes. And it is only because of these new tactics that Socialism has become what it now is: the greatest political force of our time."

Socialists of the present generation understand, as contemporaries did not, the depth and breadth of the intellect of Karl Marx. In his novel, *The Tragic Comedians*,

George Meredith has paid an immortal tribute to the genius of Ferdinand Lassalle, who is his hero under the name of Alvan. May we not venture to say of Marx what Meredith says of Lassalle: "The man . . . was of a mighty nature not unheroical, a man of the active grappling modern brain which wrestles with facts, to keep the world alive, and can create them, to keep it spinning. A Faust-like legend might spring from him; he had a devil."

"A Faust-like legend"—these words remind us, by the grave of Karl Marx, that Socialism, as he understood it, had its mystical elements. Jean Jaurès explains them in a singular passage of his *Studies in Socialism*. The working-man, says Jaurès, was to Marx the supreme figure of history.

"As the Christian God humbled Himself to the lowest level of suffering humanity that He might raise all men; as the Saviour, that He might indeed redeem all mankind, was obliged to descend to a poverty close to that of the beasts, beneath which no man was to be found; as that infinite self-abasement of God was the condition of the infinite exaltation of man; so in the dialectic of Marx, the proletariat, the modern Saviour, has had to be stripped of all credit, despoiled of every right, humbled to the very depths of social and historical annihilation, that in raising itself it might raise all mankind. And as the God-man, in order that He might continue His mission, had to remain poor, suffering and humiliated until the triumphant death which set all men free from death, so the proletariat fulfils its mission, in this logical scheme, most effectively if, until the last uprising, until the revolution which shall call mankind from its grave, it bears an ever weightier cross, the essential law of opposition and depression at the hands of capitalism."

Are not these words, written by a non-Christian Socialist, deserving of consideration by Christians? Every worker for the poor in great cities must be conscious of a certain kinship with Karl Marx. Social reformers join

with Socialists in thanking him for his efforts towards the emancipation of the people. If Marx had lived one year longer he would have seen Mr. Gladstone's government confer the franchise upon the agricultural labourer, thus putting the corner-stone on that great work of political reform which carries with it the sure promise of social reform. Could he have lived till 1909 and seen how in the land of his adoption free education (one of the articles of the Communist Manifesto) had been carried by a Conservative Government; how the means of transit, lighting and water supplies were falling under the control of municipalities; how a Liberal Ministry had carried Old Age Pensions; how the welfare of the poorest classes has become in all European countries the primary concern of statesmen—might he not have laid to rest his confused and feverish dreams of revolution? Daniel Halévy, in his book on the working class movement in France,¹ remarks with much truth that Socialism has helped the masses to organize themselves for the promotion of constitutional reforms.

"Socialism," he says, "has not let loose the war of classes, but has modified it in the most fortunate way. . . . In former times the people rose tumultuously to carry out a Jacquerie, or the bourgeoisie called them up against the nobles, against the King. The people were drawn out like a devil from its box; then, when once the blows had been given and received, they were got rid of as quickly as possible. So in 1830 the manufacturers closed their factories that they might set their workmen free for street-fighting. Two years later, these same manufacturers, uniformed as national guards, fired upon the same workmen, who had revolted without leave. Now-a-days the people do not waste their strength in profitless insurrections. They organize themselves wisely and seek in their Congresses for the principles of a juster society. Nothing to compare with this has been seen in the past. The entrance

¹ *Essais sur le Mouvement Ouvrier en France.* (Paris: Librairie Georges Bellais, 17 Rue Cujas.) 1901.

into action of the working masses is one of the chief facts of history—perhaps it is the greatest of all facts.”

The more moderate Socialists, as we have shown in the course of our inquiry, are becoming an opportunist party. While firmly maintaining some of the old doctrinaire principles, and professing the sincerest reverence for the memory of Karl Marx as a people's prophet, they are tending to merge themselves with the Radical and Labour Parliamentary wings. Werner Sombart says—

“None of the ‘Radicals’—neither Bebel, nor Ferri, nor Guesde, nor Hyndman, nor Adler, nor any one else who counts for anything in the Socialist movement in his own country, and has the masses behind him—is to-day (at least, in his political action) anything but a realistic-evolutionary Socialist.”¹

Dr. Karl Diehl says with perfect accuracy that Eduard Bernstein is “a democratic social reformer, and as such sharply opposed to Marxism.”² We doubt, however, whether the Königsberg professor discerns quite accurately the tendencies of the time when he suggests that Bernstein stands almost alone among Socialists, and that his aspirations are a mere “pious wish.” Our own studies have led us to the conclusion that Bernstein has a large and influential following among the younger German Socialists, and that his arguments have deeply influenced thoughtful minds in Britain, France and Russia. Prof. Diehl says: “There is no longer any place for Bernstein within the ranks of German Social Democracy;”³ but this independent thinker has appealed, for the last ten years, to a European public. If his books are the mere utterances of a Liberal who has dared to call himself a Socialist, though possessing no claim to the title, what are

¹ *Sozialismus und Soziale Bewegung*, p. 242.

² *Ueber Sozialismus, Kommunismus und Anarchismus*, p. 220.

³ *Ibid.*

we to say of the opportunism of Jaurès, as expressed by his biographer, M. Gustave Téry? The motto which Jaurès gave to M. Téry, as expressing the spirit of his political career, was: "*Age quod agis*—tout dépend de l'heure"¹—Do what you are doing; everything depends on the time. "*Age quod agis*—there is my motto," says the most strenuous of modern French Socialists. What would Karl Marx have thought of it? Is there any point of contact between the comfortably-placed French bourgeois Socialist leader of to-day and the philosopher of half-a-century ago, whose mind seems to belong to the dark and tempestuous elements of nature, whose burning fancy carried sword and fire through Europe, who saw thrones shrivelled up in the blast of the people's wrath? Has either of them—(a more practical question)—any link with the earnest Liberal social reformer who is unconvinced by the arguments of Socialism? Surely Maurice Bourguin is right when, at the close of his powerful argument against Socialism, he acknowledges that every reformer must join with the Socialists in awakening the aspirations of the masses after better things.

• "It is the vision of an ideal city where justice reigns," he says, "which keeps alive among the stalwarts of the revolutionary party the ardour and passion of combat; it is this which supports the poorest during the miseries of the strike, and which inspires the greatest sacrifices. In this we find the most abundant spring of energy. If that spring were to dry up, there would be an end of the development of the working classes, who depend before all things on their own efforts. But why should that ardour die out amongst the workers when their minds, instructed by experience, have learned to regard the collectivist ideal as an idle dream, and to measure their hopes by realities? . . . The recognition of the true facts will not diminish their enthusiasm, because they know that the real end of their movement—the progressive advance of

¹ *Jean Jaurès*; par Gustave Téry, p. 18.

wages by the power of the workers' organizations—is in itself an ideal well worth winning, an end worth effort and sacrifice.”¹

The day of Socialist victory, as Marx understood it, fades into an ever more distant future. The essential condition of such a triumph is unity. At the present time there is no unity among Socialists as to the goal they are seeking, or as to the means of reaching that goal. Nor is there any sign that the working-men of the world are prepared to surrender patriotic interests and enter into a great cosmopolitan alliance for the overthrow of capitalistic rule and the establishment of the international Socialist State.

The real service rendered by Marx is that indirectly and unconsciously he quickened the zeal for social reform. Georges Renard, in his novel, *The Conversion of André Savenay*, says that men are divided into two classes: those who acquiesce in the wrongs of which the world is full, and those who labour to get rid of them. Social reformers, no less than Socialists, are determined that justice and righteousness shall prevail, though they decline to accept the particular method of the expropriation of the present property holders.

We may apply to Karl Marx, the descendant of a long line of Rabbis, the saying of Wieland on Reuchlin, who revived the study of Hebrew literature for Europe, but became entangled in the obscure subtleties of the Kabbala. Reuchlin, says Wieland, with his mighty “Come forth,” summoned from its grave the corpse of Hebrew learning. “The dead came forth, wrapped in the cerements of Rabbinical wisdom, and with the Kabbala bound about his head like a napkin.” It remained for later ages to

¹ *Les Systèmes Socialistes et l'Évolution Économique*, p. 386.

pronounce the far easier word, "Loose him and let him go."

So Marx called up a swathed and terrifying figure, in which the world sees the dread spectre of Revolution. May not the Socialists of the future, working in alliance with Liberal and Labour representatives, help to strip away the grim disguise, and to unveil the kindly features of a radical and comprehensive Social Reform ?

SUPPLEMENTARY CHAPTERS

REVOLUTIONARY SYNDICALISM

I

LEADERS AND PRINCIPLES

WITHIN the past ten years a movement has grown up in France and Italy which aims at capturing the trades-unions in the interests of an extreme form of Socialism. The so-called "Revolutionary Syndicalism"¹ has had its origin inside the Socialist camp. Such leaders as Lagardelle and Labriola are careful to insist on this in their public addresses. "We are the only true Socialists," they declare, "because we alone are determined to maintain that warfare of classes which was the cardinal principle of Marx." They go beyond their master in this sense, that while he saw the storm-clouds gathering overhead and was content to await the vengeance which history was about to take on the oppressors of the poor, they are resolved to make history.

The body of Marxian doctrine is regarded by these men as like an old palimpsest, from which worthless over-writing must be cleared away, or as the fresco on a cathedral wall, which has been obscured by coats of whitewash. They consider Socialism in its later developments as merely a slight advance upon the existing bourgeois régime. True Socialism, they say, ought to work, not through any Parliamentary group, but through the trades-unions. These associations are in close and direct touch with the wage-earners; it is through them, and not through State action, that the final overthrow of capitalism will be accomplished.

Revolutionary Syndicalism, it might be argued with much plausibility, is the child of disappointment and jealousy. Disappointment, because the great army of Socialist voters have been able to accomplish so little through Parliamentary action;

¹ The words "syndicate," "sindacati" are not used in our English sense of the word "syndicate." They mean "workers' syndicates," *i.e.* trades-unions.

jealousy, because so many Socialist leaders have accepted office with its emoluments. Yet there is something not wholly ignoble in the new teaching. The river of Socialism, the Syndicalists think, is flowing through a flat, green, slumberous landscape—the Enchanted Ground of the proletariat.

“That ground,” says Bunyan, “was all grown over with briars and thorns, excepting here and there, where was an enchanted arbour, upon which if a man sits, or in which if a man sleeps, it is a question, say some, whether ever he shall rise or wake again in this world.”

Every seat in Parliament accepted by a Socialist is, in the view of the Revolutionaries, like an enchanted arbour. The Socialist M.P. finds the House of Commons “warm and promising, finely wrought above-head, furnished with benches and settles. It also has in it a soft couch, where the weary may lean.” In such an arbour Heedless and Too-bold were found wrapped in deepest slumber. The pilgrims tried to wake them, but there came no answer.

“Then the Guide did shake them, and did what he could to disturb them. Then said one of them, ‘I will pay you when I take my money.’ At which the Guide shook his head. ‘I will fight so long as I can hold my sword in my hand,’ said the other. At this one of the children laughed.”

The men who call themselves Revolutionary Syndicalists would plead with each Socialist delegate to a representative Chamber that he should walk, as Mr. Valiant and Mr. Greatheart walked on the Enchanted Ground, “each man with his sword drawn in his hand,” knowing that this is a dangerous place. Watching the course of events, the Syndicalists complain that the Socialist M.P. becomes a mere hanger-on of the Liberal and Radical parties, that he loses his passion for the class-warfare, and is imperceptibly lulled into drowsiness.

“Back to the sources!” is the cry of the younger leaders of Syndicalism. “Let us escape,” they say, “from this perilous, sleep-producing river-basin. Let us follow the stream to the wild mountain-wells where it took its origin.” The average orthodox Socialist, who turns to the literature of “Syndicalism,” after

mastering the newer standard authorities, must feel like the Piccadilly or Hyde Park loungee who is set down, on a stormy afternoon, at the entrance to the Larig-Ghru on the Aviemore side. That narrow, drenched grass-path will lead him, if he cares to venture, to the glories of Braemar and Deeside; but as the rain grows heavier, and the wind shakes the surface of Loch Ennach, and the mists hide the black fastnesses of Sgoran Dubh, he is glad to re-enter his carriage and return to sunshine and sparkling streams.

In April 1907 an international conference was held in Paris for the purpose of examining the relations between Syndicalism and Socialism. The chair was taken by Victor Griffuelhes, and the chief speakers were Arturo Labriola, Robert Michels, Boris Kritchewsky and Hubert Lagardelle. A report of the proceedings has been published under the editorship of Prof. Lagardelle. In his preface he notes these points—

“(1) If the whole of Socialism is comprised in the class-war, we may say that the whole of Socialism is comprised in Syndicalism, because outside Syndicalism there is no class warfare.

“(2) The national conditions which are most favourable for the development of Syndicalism are those in which historical and political conditions allow of the highest revolutionary excitation of the proletariat, and of its clear-cut separation from the other classes.”

On the first point, Lagardelle remarks that class-warfare implies a total rupture between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie—“that is, between two worlds which have contrary ideas of life.” “This warfare,” he goes on, “presumes that the working-class, inspired by a permanent spirit of revolt against the masters of production and politics, has succeeded in isolating itself within its natural boundaries, and in creating for itself at all points its own institutions and its own circle of ideas. It is on that condition only that the Socialism of class-warfare imagines that it would be possible to realise in practice the transition from an enslaved to a free society.”¹

¹ *Syndicalisme et Socialisme*, pp. 3, 4. (Marcel Rivière. 1908.)

The Syndicalist deplors the degeneracy of modern Socialism and its tendency to draw closer to the bourgeois parties. He believes that the old revolutionary fervour is dying, and that many Socialists are willing to content themselves with a programme of moderate reform. He sees the cause of this decline in the policy, favoured alike by Marxians and non-Marxians, of working by Parliamentary methods. The ordinary Socialist rejoices when one of his leaders—a Jaurès, a Victor Grayson, a Millerand, Briand or Viviani—takes his place in one of the world's legislatures.

“Wrong, all wrong,” cries the Syndicalist, “our sole business is with the interests of the wage-earners.” “A working-class party,” he argues, “which transforms itself into an ordinary political party, which appeals to the voters on behalf of its own nominees and seeks at a general election to return the largest possible number of members to Parliament, must inevitably become flaccid. It suffers enfeeblement because it is obliged to seek support from many varying interests and to soften its principles so as to meet the requirements of varying groups. Thus it gradually ceases to be a pure party of the people, and forgets that its sole concern is to promote the interests of the wage-earning masses.”

The Syndicalist is more embittered against the orthodox Marxians than against the Revisionists or Reformers. The men of Bernstein's school, he considers, deserve respect because they frankly disavow revolutionary tactics, but the leaders who mutter day and night in the Marxian law, while pursuing their ends by constitutional methods, are guilty of betraying the people.

The leaders of this neo-Marxian revival dread the possible ascendancy of so-called “intellectuals” in the ranks of the working-men. It is against the interests of true Socialism, they believe, that any of its representatives should take a share in Parliamentary government. The clever artisan who works his way into Parliament becomes instantly the object of their suspicion. They follow him with jealous glances as he drives in a taxi-cab or a borrowed carriage to a duchess's reception, as he enters a West End club to lunch with some magnate of the commercial world. They ask bitterly how much he has earned by those clever articles which appear over his signature in the reviews. The mere fact of

a comrade's prosperity is an offence to the man who must set out each morning at six a.m. for a day's arduous toil.

Professor Lagardelle and his comrades have observed that the working-man who has once associated in Parliament with fellow-members of a different social standing, loses touch with the proletariat. He is a

“Reed which grows nevermore again
As a reed with the reeds of the river.”

“Experience has shown us,” says Arturo Labriola, “that there are no worse reactionaries than Socialists, when once they have attained to power.”¹

The Labour member, according to this new school, becomes dull of hearing and hard of heart. The amenities of a governing chamber, the delight of exchanging hand-work for brain-work, the intoxicating joys of popular ovations, even the late morning hours and the security of a regular though modest income, tend to unfit him for the stern business of the class conflict. He is transformed—perhaps gradually and unconsciously—into a slave of the exploiters. He has heard the call of the New Sirens, and comes “heaped with myrtle to their throne,” under the pathetic illusion that the goddess of wealth has learned at last to care for the poor.

“Oh, your pardon ! The uncouthness
Of that primal age is gone,
And the skin of dazzling smoothness
Screens not now a heart of stone.
Love has flushed those cruel faces ;
And those slackened arms forgo
The delight of death-embraces
And yon whitening bone-mounds do not grow.
‘Ah,’ you say, ‘the large appearance
Of man’s labour is but vain,
And we plead a staunch adherence
Due to pleasure as to pain.’
Pointing to earth’s careworn creatures,
‘Come,’ you murmur with a sigh :
‘Ah ! we own diviner features
Loftier bearing and a prouder eye.’”

¹ *Syndicalisme et Socialisme*, p. 19. (Bibliothèque du Mouvement Socialiste.)

Labriola remarks that Socialism, as a movement, has become a mere parliamentary machine at the service of certain politicians.

"What," he asks, "has been the result of the apostacies, the compromises, the ministerial transactions of Socialism? Never did a Socialist society appear so far from realization as when Socialists had nearly attained power. . . . The Socialists who have succeeded in seating themselves on ministerial benches did neither more nor less than their bourgeois predecessors. . . ."

The vital propositions of his school are defined by Labriola as follows—

(1) The party, an essentially political and democratic machine, is a different thing from the class.

(2) The development of Socialism must be along other lines than those of democratic parliamentary action.¹

The Syndicalist argues that the older Socialism has failed, and that Anarchism has failed.

"Parliamentary Socialism," remarks Lagardelle, "in its revolutionary no less than in its reformist aspects, has lived upon the illusion that parties are the political expression of classes, and that classes find in Parliament a mechanical register of their respective forces. But experience has shown that parties, instead of being the counterpart of classes, are a heterogeneous mixture of elements borrowed from all social categories, and that there is no longer any real relation between the political influence of the Socialist parties and the real power of the working-class. The truth is, that Parliamentary Socialism has not only failed to open up any unbridgeable gulf between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, but it has become one of the constituent factors of the State and one of the agents in the 'solidarist action' of the democracy."

Anarchists, according to the same authority, have cast their nets too wide, and have been feeding themselves, all unconsciously, on the intellectual ideals of the bourgeoisie. Syndicalism, on the other hand, regards the workers as the only class who will succeed in regenerating the world—on condition, however, that they keep themselves strictly apart from bourgeois influence.²

¹ *Syndicalisme et Socialisme*, pp. 13, 14.

² The following words of Prof. Lagardelle may be quoted—

"Il (le syndicalisme) prend les producteurs dans les cadres mêmes de l'atelier et des groupements qui le prolongent ; syndicats, fédérations, bourses de travail, etc., et il

Revolutionary Syndicalism is guided at this moment by a group of remarkable men both in France and Italy. Arturo Labriola, especially, wins the admiration of all who listen to him or read his writings. Robert Hunter, who heard him at Rome in 1906, pays the following tribute to his eloquence—

“Whether considered as a Socialist or as an Anarchist, Labriola cannot be explained. At present he is illogical and contradictory both in his thought and his activity. But with all that can be said against him, he has rare personal magnetism. I sat for three hours listening to him, and I may say that with few, if any, of the ordinary gifts of the orator, he is the most thrilling speaker I have ever heard. At times his discourse was like organ music, rising and falling with a peculiar harmony. His climax was not a usual one; it was climax upon climax until at last one seemed to burst in profusion, like a great sky-rocket. . . . It was a most remarkable speech, apparently the sincere and frank expression of his own soul. . . . He won a personal triumph that was immense.”¹

The leadership of Italian Socialism, it may be added, has been for the most part in the hands of well-to-do men of university standing. Signor Turati, founder of the *Critica Sociale* and leader of the Reformist Party, is a wealthy lawyer.²

The comfortably placed prophets of the new school appeal to the most heroic instincts of humanity. Their war-cry—for others—is really a summons to martyrdom. The man who dares, under the present order of society, to carry the principles of this party to their logical conclusion, must have cast the world behind him as completely as the Nihilist who throws a bomb under a monarch's carriage. There is, in fact, notwithstanding official denials, a close relationship between this strange party and the Anarchism of

organise leur révolte contre l'autorité patronale; en niant le pouvoir et la loi, en enrichissant de fonctions les institutions ouvrières, il disloque l'État, et le dépouille de ses prérogatives; par la grève, par la propagande pour la grève générale, il détruit, heure par heure, au fur et à mesure qu'elle se produit, l'œuvre mensongère d'union des classes que poursuit la démocratie; il donne corps enfin aux idées spécifiques du prolétariat, c'est-à-dire à cet ensemble de sentiments juridiques nés au cœur de la lutte et qui constituent la base du droit nouveau, du droit d'une société sans maîtres.”

—*Syndicalisme et Socialisme*, p. 5.

¹ *Socialists at Work*, p. 50. (Macmillan. 1909.)

² Turati said at the Rome Congress: “Between the bourgeois parties there is not a hostility so great or so violent as that which separates us from the Syndicalists, in spite of the soft lie of sweet fraternity in our party.”

Bakunin. The Syndicalist, like the Anarchist, fights against the monarchy, the church, the army—in a word, against the State. Mr. Ensor has described the propaganda not unfairly as “the first big attempt for thirty years to divert and subvert the Socialist movement by an Anarchist movement from within.”¹

II

THE TEACHING OF GEORGES SOREL

The philosopher of revolutionary Syndicalism is Georges Sorel. Werner Sombart calls him “the Marx of the new doctrine,” which is sometimes designated “Sorelism”; and considers that a fresh impulse was given by his small work, published in 1897, *The Socialist Future of Trades Unions*.²

Among Sorel's numerous later writings, the most characteristic is his *Thoughts on Violence*.³ The work is introduced by a long and very instructive letter to Daniel Halévy,⁴ dated July 15, 1907. In this letter Sorel tells us that his ambition has been to awaken in the hearts of some men the consciousness of a vocation. He believes that in every human soul there is “a metaphysical hearth-place.” Under the thick ashes the dream lies hidden. It is buried under a mass of ready-made dogmas; the inspiring teacher is he who will rake amongst the embers till the living flame leaps up.

Georges Sorel proclaims himself, in the first place, a pessimist. Outside that doctrine, he thinks, no great thing has ever been accomplished in the world. The real reason why Greek philosophy produced feeble moral results was that it rested on a too optimistic basis. “Socrates was sometimes a quite intolerably optimistic thinker.”

Modern political life, in M. Sorel's opinion, has evolved a very dangerous type of optimist. This is the man who thinks that

¹ *Modern Socialism*, p. xv. (Harpers. 1907.)

² *Sozialismus und Soziale Bewegung*, p. 110.

³ *Réflexions sur la Violence*. (Librairie de Pages Libres, Paris, 17 Rue Séguier. 1908.)

⁴ Daniel Halévy and Léon de Seilhac are twin authorities on French working-class movements. M. Sorel's book is based on a series of articles which appeared in *Le Mouvement Socialiste*.

small and gradual reforms will solve the tremendous social problem. "As soon as his friends are in power, he declares that things must take their course, that we must not be in too great a hurry, that we must be satisfied with what these kind friends provide for us." He who, but a little while ago, was a raging revolutionary, becomes the most placid of party sheep.

M. Sorel is thinking, no doubt, of many strange facts in modern political history when he says: "The optimist may lead his country into the worst catastrophes."

"During the Terror, the men who shed most blood were those who had the keenest desire that their fellows should enjoy the golden age of which they had dreamed, and who felt the strongest sympathy for human suffering. They were optimists, idealists, and men of feeling, and they showed themselves the more inexorable because they thirsted more keenly than others for universal happiness."¹

Sorel draws a sharp distinction between the new school and the literary and philosophic Anarchism which flourished twenty years ago in Paris. That type of Anarchism was in its intellectual aspect entirely a bourgeois movement, and the followers of Jules Guesde frequently reproached its leaders on this account.

"Many Anarchists got tired at length of reading the same grandiloquent imprecations which were constantly being launched against the capitalist régime, and they began to seek a path which would lead them to really revolutionary acts. They entered the *syndicats*, which by means of strikes attended with violence were putting into practice, in some sort of way, that social war about which they had heard so much talk. Historians will one day recognize that this entrance of the Anarchists into the *syndicats* was one of the greatest events which have happened in our time. . . . The Anarchist writers who remained faithful to their old revolutionary literature do not seem to have regarded very favourably the passing over of their friends into the *syndicats*. This attitude of theirs shows that the Anarchists who became Syndicalists displayed a genuine originality, and were not applying theories which had been manufactured in philosophic brotherhoods.

¹ "Le pessimiste," says M. Sorel, "n'a point les folies sanguinaires de l'optimiste affolé par les résistances imprévues que rencontrent ses projets; il ne songe point à faire le bonheur des générations futures en égorgeant les égoïstes actuels." *Réflexions sur la Violence*, p. xvi.

They taught the workers above all things that they need not blush for acts of violence.”¹

Much of the writing in which Syndicalist leaders attempt to distinguish between their own position and that of the Anarchists is confused and contradictory. Werner Sombart says truly that the doctrines of Syndicalism are not yet fully worked out, that the leaders are uncertain on some of the main principles and on innumerable details, and contradict each other here and there on important matters.

We proceed to notice a few of the essential points of Sorel's teaching.

“Revolutionary Syndicalism,” he says, “nourishes in the masses the disposition towards strikes, and can flourish only in places where notable strikes, attended with acts of violence, have taken place.” The theory of the *class warfare* is a first principle with Sorel.

“Now-a-days,” he remarks, “Parliamentary Socialists are no longer thinking of insurrection; if they should mention the word occasionally, it is only to give themselves an air of importance. They teach that the voting ticket has taken the place of the gun.”

“Smoothers,” like M. Clemenceau and M. Bourgeois, have been doing their utmost to bring about that social peace which of all things is most hateful to the true Syndicalist. Léon Bourgeois said in 1905—

“The class warfare is a fact, but it is a cruel fact. I do not believe that we shall reach the solution of the problem by allowing it to continue, but rather by suppressing it . . . by making it possible for all men to regard themselves as co-workers at the same task.”

“Capitalist society is so rich,” writes Sorel, “and the future opens up before it in such rosy colours that it bears fearful burdens without making too loud a complaint. In America, the politicians squander unblushingly sums brought in by heavy taxes. In Europe, military preparations swallow up sums which are constantly growing larger. Social peace may well be purchased by some additional sacrifices. Experience proves that the middle classes

¹ *Réflexions sur la Violence*, pp. xlii, xliii.

will readily allow themselves to be despoiled, if only they are squeezed a little and if their dread of the revolution is aroused. The future belongs to the party which will be able to handle most daringly the spectre of revolution.”¹

“A cowardly bourgeoisie” is seeking, according to Sorel, “the chimera of social peace.”

Parliamentary Socialists are allowing themselves to be ensnared by the cry of “Peace, peace.” Bitter and contemptuous language is therefore used against them.

“Parliamentary Socialists cannot understand the objects at which the new school is aiming. They imagine that all Socialism resolves itself in the last resort, into a search for the means of gaining power. Are the people of the new school [they ask] trying, perhaps, to make a higher bid in order to win the confidence of the simple electors and steal away the seats from the Socialists in possession? An apology for violence might have a very regrettable result if it disgusted the working classes with the [party] electioneering tactics. This would spoil the chances of the Socialist candidates, because abstentions would become more numerous. Does the new school wish to stir up new civil wars? That seems a mad policy to our great statesmen.”

Parliamentary Socialists like Jaurès are pleased, says M. Sorel, to see a certain mild agitation going on amongst the people. It must be kept well within bounds and it must always be under the strict control of the politicians.

“An agitation, skilfully kept within limits, is exceedingly useful to the Parliamentary Socialists, who boast to the Government and the rich middle classes that they are able to moderate the revolution. Thus they can carry through successfully the financial affairs in which they are interested; they obtain small favours from many influential electors, and they get social measures passed through Parliament in order to give themselves importance in the eyes of the noodles who suppose that these Socialists are great legislative reformers. In order that all this business may prosper, it is necessary that a little agitation should always be going on—just enough to frighten the middle classes.”

¹ *Réflexions sur la Violence*, pp. 16, 17.

Men like Jaurès have a difficult game to play. "They must make the workers believe that they are carrying the banner of revolution, the bourgeoisie that they are stemming the danger which threatens it, and the country that they represent an irresistible current of opinion." Skill, finesse, tact and courage are needed in superabundant measure for such a game. The Syndicalist despises all the tricky methods of political life, and adapts to his own conception of Socialism, though with a very different meaning, the words which Bernstein quoted from *Maria Stuart*: "Let her dare to appear as what she is."

Hatred for the professional politician is deeply rooted in Sorel's mind.

He seeks, further, to stir up the spirit of class warfare by his scornful allusions to the present possessors of capital. He loves to write of the decadence of the well-to-do classes. The proud, independent captains who created the great modern industries have passed away and their place, he argues, has been taken by an "over-policed aristocracy, which asks to be allowed to live in peace." The comfortable middle classes, in Sorel's view, have become almost as dull and stupid as the French nobles of the eighteenth century. He uses the expression *L'abrutissement de la haute bourgeoisie*. His general attitude towards property might be expressed in these words of Shibli Bagarag on Shagpat :

"Lo, now, the Sword ! it leapeth to be at him, and 'twill be as the keen icicle of winter to that perishing foliage, that doomed crop ! So doth the destined minute destroy with a flash the hoarded arrogance of ages."

Georges Sorel is not very fortunate in his comparison of the Syndicalists to the three hundred Spartans at Thermopylæ. "Let us hail the Revolutionaries," he says, "as the Greeks hailed the Spartan heroes who defended the pass of Thermopylæ and helped to keep the light burning in the ancient world." We remember the motto of Thermopylæ, "Go, stranger, and tell Sparta that we died here in obedience to her laws." Self-sacrifice has ever been the first law of heroism. Socialism has its heroes, like Wilhelm Liebknecht, who, as Kurt Eisner tells us in his all-too-brief biography, spent five years of his life behind prison walls. Liebknecht has given us, in his *Memoirs of Marx*, a

modest story of his early sufferings. He does not take the sufferer's tone or appeal for any one's sympathy. There is not a trace of "*Jammerbaserei*" anywhere in the writings of Luther's Socialist descendant; but he does mention that the young Socialists who frequented the house of Marx in London often went to their studies in the British Museum library without having tasted a morsel of breakfast.¹

Marx drove on his young comrades to the most zealous application, was amazed to find that Wilhelm Liebknecht could not read Spanish, and taught him the language with the strictness of a school-master.

The leaders of Revolutionary Syndicalism are successful lawyers, professors and journalists. Werner Sombart says that as far as he has known them personally, they are "charming, refined, cultured people." He remarks on their "clean linen, good manners and elegant wives." They are *Kulturmenschen*, he says, with whom it is a pleasure to associate.

Sorel's Anti-Patriotism

Anti-militarism is a cardinal principle of the new teaching. Sorel explains that the Syndicalist does not oppose the army because he objects to the severity of the discipline or to the length of military service. He is not influenced by an exaggerated humanitarianism. He is an anti-militarist because the army is the clearest and most tangible manifestation of the State.

"Syndicalists do not propose to reform the State, as the men of the eighteenth century did. They wish to destroy it, because they want to carry into practice that idea of Marx that the Socialist revolution ought not to end by replacing one governing minority by another minority. The Syndicalists put an even firmer stamp upon their doctrine when they give it a more ideological aspect and declare themselves anti-patriots—thus following the Communist Manifesto. On this ground it is impossible that there

ff.¹ "Manchmal hatte man keinen Bissen im Leibe, allein vom Gang ins Museum hielt das nicht ab—hatte man dort doch bequeme Stühle zum Sitzen und im Winter eine behagliche Wärme—was zu Haus fehlte, wenn man überhaupt ein 'Zu Haus' oder 'Heim' hatte."—Liebknecht's *Karl Marx*, p. 47.

should be the smallest agreement between the Syndicalists and the official Socialists. The latter, indeed, talk of breaking up everything, but they attack the men in power rather than the power itself. They hope to possess the force of the State, and they reckon that on the day when they took possession of the Government they would need an army. They would carry out a foreign policy, and, in consequence, they also would have to boast of their devotion to the Fatherland."

Sorel assumes throughout that the masses of French workers are deeply tinctured with anti-patriotism. The Parliamentary Socialists, he suggests, are aware of this also, but in accordance with their usual tactics they seek to make the best of two worlds. When Hervé and the anti-militarists were condemned, the national council of the Socialist party voted an order of the day denouncing that "verdict of hatred and fear," declaring that class justice did not know how to respect freedom of opinion, protesting against the employment of troops in the strikes, and asserting in proud language the need for action and for an international understanding among the workers for the suppression of war. Sorel makes the dry comment: "All this is very clever, but the fundamental question is evaded." The Socialist and the Syndicalist, as Sorel shows, have entirely opposing ideas with regard to the State. The Socialist hopes to transmute the present forms of government into a glorious State of the future, an idealist bureaucracy; the Syndicalist seeks to destroy the State, to set up everywhere factories and workshops without masters and to unite the working classes merely by the bond of loosely-federated unions. Some of Sorel's violent language need not be taken too seriously, and readers of Syndicalist polemics may admit the truth of Werner Sombart's saying that where there is a powerful dominant church it is not a bad thing that heresy should sometimes arise. The men of the revolutionary school, like the reformists of Bernstein's type, have at least prevented what Sorel calls "The Decomposition of Marxism."¹

It has often been suggested that the triumph of Syndicalism

¹ *La Décomposition du Marxisme*, by Georges Sorel. Bibliothèque du Mouvement Socialiste, No. III. (Librairie des Sciences Politiques et Sociales, Paris, 30 Rue Jacob.)

would be accompanied by acts of violence comparable to those of the French Revolution. Sorel ventures to hope that the transition may be peacefully accomplished, though his own philosophy carries within it a tremendous impulse towards crime. If the great ideals of religion and patriotism are abandoned by the masses, what will hold in check the animal instincts which ran riot during the French Revolution?

Sorel on the General Strike

The whole idea of Socialism, according to Sorel, is summed up in the general strike. All partial strikes are interesting and important because they are attempts on a smaller scale to prepare for the great final overthrow. Sorel says—

“The ‘new school’ which calls itself Marxian, Syndicalist and revolutionary, declared itself in favour of the idea of the general strike as soon as it was able to attain a clear consciousness of the true meaning of its own doctrine, of the consequences of its activity, or of its own original character. Thus it was led to break with the ancient, official, Utopian and political dogmatic authorities, who have a horror of the general strike. It was compelled to enter the true movement of the revolutionary proletariat, which for a long time past has made acceptance of the idea of a general strike the test by means of which the Socialism of the workers is distinguished from that of the amateur revolutionary.”¹

As used by Parliamentary Socialists, says the sarcastic Sorel, all the old formulas lose their true sense.

“The class warfare still remains the great principle, but it must be subordinated to national solidarity. Internationalism is an article of faith in honour of which the most moderate Socialists declare that they are ready to pronounce the most solemn oaths, but patriotism also imposes sacred duties. The emancipation of the toilers ought to be the work of the toilers themselves—but the true emancipation consists in voting for a professional politician, in securing him a salary which will make him comfortable, in taking to oneself a master. The State will finally disappear, and we must not dispute what Engels has written on this point. But

¹ *Réflexions sur la Violence*, p. 86.

that disappearance will take place in such a far-off future that we ought to prepare ourselves for it by using the State meanwhile to stuff the politicians with choice morsels.”¹

In many passages, Sorel holds up to ridicule official Socialists like Jaurès and Millerand. He describes their teaching as “noisy, chattering, lying Socialism.” The Syndicalist, with his one bold idea of the general strike, feels himself superior to Jaurès and his friends, who cherish a hundred confused and contradictory schemes for the amelioration of human suffering. Sorel attempts to explain why the idea of a general strike is not popular in England. The English people, he thinks, have shown an amazing incapacity to grasp the idea of the class warfare. “Their thought is still dominated by mediæval influences. A corporation enjoying special privileges, or, at least, protected by the law, always appears to them as the ideal of a working-class organization. The expression “a working-class aristocracy” was invented for England as a description of the trade-unionists, and, as a matter of fact, trade-unionism is seeking to gain favours for itself from the legislature. We might therefore say that the dislike which England feels for the general strike ought to be considered as a strong argument in favour of the strike by all who regard class warfare as the essential element of Socialism.” M. Sorel speaks contemptuously of the work of Mr. Sidney Webb, and remarks that those who have spread the English writer’s fame in France do not understand a word of Socialism.

At the close of his *Reflections on Violence*, Sorel claims that there is something of a powerful, original and virgin force in this idea of the total ruin of institutions and manners. “All the old abstract dissertations on the future Socialist State are becoming useless. We are moving on into the domain of real history, to the interpretation of facts, to ethical appreciations of the revolutionary movement.”

¹ *Réflexions sur la Violence*, p. 87.

III

TRADES-UNIONS AND THE GENERAL STRIKE

Karl Marx believed that the present order of society is destined to disappear in a great catastrophe. The path of the destroying angel was, to his mind, as mysterious as that of the secret, hidden forces which produce the earthquake. As a student of economics, he could only prophesy and wait. The modern Syndicalist repudiates the master's fatalistic doctrines. He is not content with the thought that a slow vengeance is gathering like a thunder-cloud in some part of the heavens. He wishes to hasten on the emancipation of the toilers, and he sees the remedy for their sufferings in the general strike. The leaders of the new revolutionary party find no pleasure in the dreams and visions of constructive Socialism. The Socialist State, they say, would be an aristocratic, or a bureaucratic government, precisely like the systems which have preceded it.

"A new garrison in the old fortress—nothing more! The new occupants will make some change, no doubt, in the old frontage; they will repaint it; they will hoist another flag. But they will not be able to do anything more, for the rot of State rule will soon lay hold upon them. It will soon be as necessary to organize a revolution against them as it is to arrange one against the exploiters of to-day."¹

The revolutionary movement may be traced back, historically, to the Waldeck-Rousseau law of 1884, which legalized the trades-unions (*syndicats*). Official Socialists in France, as Mermeix reminds us, welcomed the measure of 1884, because they thought it would add to the party strength. The trades-unions, in their view, would provide a useful recruiting ground for Socialism. It we may venture to draw a parallel from Methodism, men like

¹ Mermeix, *Le Syndicalisme contre le Socialisme*, p. 16. Mermeix says elsewhere (p. 122). "C'est la grève générale qui sera la catastrophe. Cette catastrophe se distingue de celles qu'attendent les marxistes, les politiciens socialistes, en ce qu'elle ne se produira pas par hasard; elle surgira quand les ouvriers le voudront. Le syndicalisme discipline la catastrophe que les socialistes attendent avec un fatalisme de marabouts."

Jules Guesde thought that through the unions they could easily gain an almost indefinite number of members "on trial," who would be promoted, if found worthy, to full membership and to the local "class-meeting." The expectation has been disappointed. The trades-unions have developed ideas which go far beyond those of either Guesde or Jaurès.

Émile Pouget gives the fullest account of the origin and progress of the strange idea of a general strike.¹ He reminds us that the International Association of Workers was the body which, at the close of the Second Empire, expressed the economic demands of the working classes. The question of partial strikes was considered at the early gatherings of this body—from 1866 onwards—and it was forced by the pressure of events to take into account the ultimate possibility of a general strike. Between 1868 and 1873 the subject was discussed at various congresses. The Geneva Congress of 1873, after the question had been fully examined in a secret session, passed a carefully-worded resolution advising working-men to form international trade organizations and to press forward the cause of Socialism. The leaders of the *International*—which was then in an almost moribund condition—recognized that a general strike could effect nothing unless the workers had created a strong economic organization.

After the *International* had given place to other groupings, Socialists began to work for the attainment of Parliamentary power, and as Pouget admits, the idea of the general strike fell into oblivion. From the passing of the Waldeck-Rousseau law of 1884, which authorized the formation and federation of trades-unions in France, we may trace its slow recrudescence.

The first federation of French trades-unions was founded at Lyons in 1886, and the followers of Jules Guesde believed that they had captured it. They arranged that a congress should be held at Bordeaux in 1888. The police expelled the members from the city and the meetings were held at Le Bouscat, where the Socialist mayor offered entertainment to the delegates. The Guesdist doctors, says Mermeix, had captured the trades-unions,

¹ See his instructive article in Hubert Lagardelle's volume, *La Grève Générale et le Socialisme : Enquête Internationale*, pp. 36-51. See also the excellent account given by Mermeix in *Le Syndicalisme contre le Socialisme*.

not because they fancied the unions had any importance in themselves, but because they wished to prevent a rival sect from getting possession of them. "These haughty 'intellectuals' thought their ascendancy over the federated trades-unions so firmly established that they did not trouble to appear at Le Bouscat."¹

A workman whose name is not recorded² introduced at this meeting the idea of the general strike, and a strongly-worded resolution accepting the suggestion was carried without discussion, and amid general approval.

The first exponent of the "general strike" idea whose name is known to the public was a Parisian workman of anarchist views named Tortelier. He was like one of those strange, uncouth figures who appeared, as if from the ground, during the French Revolution. In thinking of the appearance of this journeyman carpenter at the London Congress of 1888, we are reminded of Carlyle's words: "No, friends, this Revolution is not of the consolidating kind." Tortelier might, from his appearance and language, have been a comrade of Marat. Among well-known public men who supported the idea of a general strike, the earliest was M. Aristide Briand, the statesman who was in later years responsible for the French Disestablishment Law.

At the Congress held in 1892 at Marseilles, M. Briand carried a resolution in favour of the general strike.³

The following passage may be quoted from one of M. Briand's early speeches—

"The vote in favour of the general strike was carried with enthusiasm at Marseilles. Now you are asked to repudiate it.

¹ *Le Syndicalisme contre le Socialisme*, p. 123.

² *Ibid.* The resolution is worth quoting in full: "In view of the facts that the monopolization of the instruments of production and of capital in the hands of employers gives to the employers a power which diminishes proportionately that power which the partial strike placed in the hands of the workers: And that capital is useless unless it is put in circulation: And that the workers, therefore, by refusing to labour, destroy at one blow the power of their masters: This Congress, recognizing that the partial strike can only be a means of agitation and organization, declares that the general strike only, i.e. the complete stoppage of all work, or a revolution, can bring emancipation to the toilers."

³ In 1899 at the general congress of Socialist organizations, held in Paris, M. Briand used these words: "Citoyens, la grève générale est une conception dont j'ai quelque peu endossé la paternité."—Lagardelle's *Enquête*, p. 90. Mermeix, *op. cit.* p. 277.

But have our opponents any new arguments to offer you? No, they attack the principle of the general strike because they are thinking only of the result of the partial strikes which would have succeeded better if they could have been made general. The general strike, none the less, is a principle which by its own force has quickened the propaganda, and has strengthened the solidarity of the working classes. It is thought to be Utopian. Is it any less Utopian to expect to win political power by a voting-ticket which may be cancelled to-morrow? In any case two weapons are better than one. I don't ask you to vote for the immediate carrying into action of the general strike; but why should you refuse to vote for the principle? Are you afraid of it? Through the principle of the general strike we have destroyed the workman's selfishness. He no longer considers the strike as a combat against his employer, but as a social weapon."

The followers of Jules Guesde were sharply opposed to those of Aristide Briand, but at the Nantes Congress (1894) the principle of the general strike was adopted by 65 votes to 37. French trades-unions during the past twelve or fifteen years have encouraged strikes among their members. As a recent writer in *The Times* remarks—

"The prevailing object of the French *syndicats* has not been peace, it has avowedly been war. The unions which have professedly pursued peace were comparatively few, weak and despised; they are the *jaunes*, a name of contempt. . . . They are regarded as traitors. The other unions are the *rouges*, which are professedly militant, and the independent."¹

The idea of Tortelier and his earliest adherents was childlike in its simplicity. Jules Guesde and his philosophic circle could afford to smile at it. The artisan, some fine morning, was to stay at home instead of going to the workshop.

"The bourgeois who grows fat on the sweat of the people would waste away because the people would sweat for him no longer. The workers would carry out their strike with folded arms. They would not rush in tumultuous crowds into the streets. They would not expose themselves to the brutalities of the police and to the guns of the soldiery. They would take a walk with their families, lunch near the fortifications, in the Bois

¹ "The Labour Movement in France," *The Times*, April 20, 1909

de Vincennes, in the Bois de Boulogne, or even further out in those smiling suburbs where the rich capitalists, the exploiters of the poor, have their country houses. Would not this be a better way than that of the Socialist politicians, who advised the working-men in the first place to vote for themselves, since their victory at an election must be the first stage towards the final victory; and who, once elected, would have no other thought except how to secure re-election?"¹

The rich were to grow lean and careworn and miserable, watching with impotent fury the masses of the working-men, who were simply carrying out, in the most pleasant and peaceful manner, Lafargue's theory of the "Right to be Lazy."

When the "leech-class" had got tired of looking on, it would appeal for terms of peace.

"The proletariat would dictate its conditions. 'Give me back what you have stolen from me, that is, give me back everything, and we shall become good friends. I will return to the workshop—not that I may be any longer exploited for your profit, but to labour as a free social producer.' And the bourgeoisie, since it could do no otherwise, would sign that treaty."²

From such an idyllic dream the least thoughtful among the working-men will be awakened, sooner or later, by the remembrance that the wealthy classes could quickly starve out the poor. They have provisions, they have savings; the proletariat has little or nothing. In the case of a general strike the bourgeois could fall back on his larder and his cellar. The strikers, almost from the earliest days, would be thrown into the most pitiable distress. They might fancy they could conquer their enemies by hunger, but the sharpest and longest pangs would be felt in their own households. A really general strike would paralyze all communication as well as stop production, with consequences hardly to be predicted.

The Guesdists have warned their revolutionary comrades that in the event of a general economic strike, the last end of the labouring masses would be worse than the first. They would be forced to re-enter the factory, and as beaten men they would have

¹ Mermeix, *op. cit.* p. 135.

² *Ibid.* pp. 135, 136.

to accept harder conditions than those which had provoked the revolt. It would be the workers, not the employers, who would pay the war indemnity.

Syndicalists who recognize the folly of expecting so easy and sudden a victory still cling to the idea of a general strike under favourable conditions. It is recognized by Socialists of all schools that the members of trades-unions in any country would be justified in organizing a general strike if a government were to abolish the worker's franchise, or his right of association. For such a cause popular passion would be aroused with a vehemence which would carry all before it.

Syndicalism differs from Socialism or Collectivism in its hatred of the idea of State control, in its desire to establish a multitude of loosely-federated, autonomous trades-unions, the members of which shall labour in workshops without masters. Werner Sombart has pointed out that Syndicalism has taken root in those countries only where the trades-unions, being of recent origin, are comparatively weak and poor. "A rich union becomes timid and fears conflict; it adopts an exclusive attitude towards the poorer class of workers; in its corporate capacity it becomes narrow-hearted."

Only in the less wealthy unions can the idea of the general strike obtain a respectful hearing. For the general strike must be carried out, in the last resort, either by men who have personally nothing to lose, or by enthusiasts who are willing to devote themselves to martyrdom. Each possessor of "the green purse and the wee pickle gowd"—to quote the words of an old Scots song—is naturally inclined to hold it fast. The motto of the leaden casket in *The Merchant of Venice* confronts each would-be supporter of revolutionary trades-unionism, "Who chooseth me must give or hasard all he hath." The Syndicalist sets himself in spirit against all the mighty forces of the world. First and foremost, he must work for the abolition of the army. The genuine enthusiast of this school is an anti-militarist and an anti-patriot.¹ He is prepared, indeed, for fierce and bloody conflicts between the people and the military during the early days of the strike. His pro-

¹ Victor Griffuelhes, who was until recently the secretary of the General Confederation of Labour, used a characteristic expression, which is quoted by Prof. Sombart: "L'antimilitarisme fait corps avec l'action syndicale."

THE GENERAL STRIKE

ASA 205
HYPERAE

gramme includes the violent laying of hands upon the instruments of production now possessed by the capitalists ; the seizing of the railways and the dockyards. But when the trades-unionists have entered as masters into the workshops and factories where they now labour as wage-earners, armies and navies will be abolished. Of Syndicalism, even more than of its rival, Collectivist Socialism, it may be said that unless the whole world simultaneously accepted the new system, each "syndicated" state would be helplessly at the mercy of its neighbours.

IV

THE GENERAL STRIKE : VIEWS OF SOCIALIST LEADERS

The leaders of Socialism in all the chief European countries were invited some years ago by Prof. Lagardelle to express their opinions on the subject of the general strike. Their replies appeared in *Le Mouvement Socialiste* during the summer of 1904, and have since been published in a volume.¹ In his preface, M. Lagardelle says that the inquiry had its origin in the discussion on the general strike which took place during the sittings of the Socialist Congress at Amsterdam. The earlier pages of the book are occupied with contributions from the chief French Syndicalist leaders, whose views have been explained in the preceding pages. We take some characteristic extracts from the articles of representative Socialists who stand outside the circle.

Paul Lafargue

Paul Lafargue, it will be remembered, is a son-in-law of Marx. He is opposed to the general strike.

"The Social revolution," he says, "cannot arise from a strike, even a general strike, as the preachers of this idea imagine, because the mass of workers, when once they have obtained the economic or political reform which has aroused them into action, are satisfied, and meekly put on their yoke again, as was the case in the United

¹ *La Grève Générale et le Socialisme, Enquête Internationale. Opinions et Documents.* (Marcel Rivière. Paris.)

States and Belgium. The general strike does not carry within itself the revolution; on the contrary, it is the revolution which will produce the general strike. . . . The capitalist nations are ripe for a social revolution, which a political or economic crisis may cause to break forth. Its first result will be a stoppage of work in the industrial districts and the large towns. The men upon whom the pressure of events will confer a social dictatorship (like the members of the Convention of 1792) will have to take revolutionary measures in order to feed, house and clothe the mass of workless people, and to make the working classes understand that a new order is arising. If, without hesitation, they nationalize the means of production which are already centralized by the capitalists (banks, factories, railways, great landed estates, etc.); if they secure to the workers those good things produced by them which are now taken possession of by the parasites of capital; if they seize the provisions and wares in the stores and distribute them in proportion to needs; if they turn the capitalists out of their flats, mansions and pleasure-houses in order that the workers may be installed there; then the revolution will be secured and the change from wage-paid labour to co-operative labour will be carried through without too much jarring and friction."¹

Aristide Briand

M. Briand, "the father of the general strike," is at the time writing the French Premier. His views, as printed by M. Lagardelle, were not specially written for *Le Mouvement Socialiste* in 1904, but are taken from his famous speech of December 1899. M. Briand declared emphatically that he was opposed to partial strikes. Even when such strikes were successful, he thought the workers never had a full return for the sacrifices they had made.

"The workers during a strike are really isolated. Even when they have the moral and material support of the proletariat, what is that support as compared to the aid which the employers obtain from the forces of public order? The employer is never alone; he has always with him and for him, the means of repression which are at the disposal of his class, all the organized social forces, the magistracy, the officials, the army, the police agents."

¹ *La Grève Générale*, pp. 71, 72.

On the general strike, M. Briand said—

“The secret of the strength which resides in this idea of the general strike lies in the fact that it is brought into the world of labour by the very fact of economic evolution. And I declare at the outset that it is impossible, at least from the economic point of view, not to be in favour of the general strike if one is already in favour of the trades-union organization.”

The general strike, in M. Briand's opinion, is not a Utopian dream, but a very practical policy. Without it, the association of workers in the trades-unions could never attain its highest development. He acknowledged that the general strike would involve a revolution, and continued as follows—

“I admit, citizens, that the general strike, the revolution, cannot be fixed for any definite day: I admit that the revolution, unfortunately, does not depend on the goodwill of individuals; were it so, you would long ago have accomplished it. I do not deny the controlling influence which is exercised by evolution and circumstances. But I believe . . . that the human will can hasten the march of evolution and contribute powerfully in bringing circumstances to the birth. Say to the workers: create the revolution. They would very much like to do so, and if the result depended on themselves alone, they would quickly be down in the streets. They do not go, because they can foresee the reception that would await them, because they know full well that their efforts would be drowned in blood.”

(A voice: “As in 1871,” and applause.)

M. Briand: “They understand that the revolution of to-morrow, which will set free the proletariat, cannot be attempted by the old revolutionary methods. Not that I blame these methods, comrades. I am one of those who hesitate to discourage revolutionary efforts, of whatever kind they are.

“Enter the battle with the voting-ticket if you think well; I see nothing to find fault with in that, I have entered it myself as a voter, I have entered it as a candidate, and I shall doubtless return to it to-morrow. Enter the battle with pikes, sabres, pistols, guns; far from disapproving of your action, I shall feel it my duty, if the necessity should arise, to take a place in your ranks.”

M. Briand urged that in the last resort the success of the

revolution would depend upon the mobilization of the workers. If they rose as a vast and united force, the army would no longer be, in his opinion, a passive instrument in the hands of the bourgeoisie. The soldiers would refuse to fire upon the people, and besides, the army itself, even if discipline were maintained, would be helpless in presence of so huge a danger.

Jean Jaurès

M. Lagardelle did not apparently succeed in drawing an original contribution from Jaurès. He prints extracts from two articles which appeared in the *Petite République* in 1901. As we have shown, the leaders of the Syndicalists, from Georges Sorel downwards, are enemies of Jaurès.

M. Jaurès believes that the general strike would bring untold misery to the workers.

"In the general strike," he says, "the working masses, by stopping production and exchange, will themselves be starved; they will therefore be driven to acts of violence in order to support themselves, driven to seize provisions and supplies wherever they can find them. They will also be driven to strike terror into the hearts of the privileged classes, who will be threatened in their persons and their property by the inevitable wrath of the proletariat whose age-long sufferings will be, as it were, exasperated by the crisis of misery and hunger. Hence there will arise inevitable conflicts between the working classes and the maddened defenders of the capitalist system. Hence again the general strike would take on the features of a revolution."

The hope of the revolutionaries is that the forces of public order would be scattered over so wide an area that they would be helpless amid the revolt of a whole population. Jaurès points out that there is one fatal objection to the idea of a general strike. It must succeed at the first attempt, for a single failure would involve the workers in terrible disasters.

"If a general strike fails after it has changed into a revolution accompanied with violence, it will leave the capitalist system standing, but will have armed it with an implacable fury. The fear of the governing classes and even of a large proportion of the

masses will be given free course in a long succession of years of reaction. And the proletariat will for long years be disarmed, crushed down and fettered."

Jaurès asks whether the general strike has any chance of success.

"I think not. In the first place, the working classes will not rise in revolt for a general formula, such as the introduction of Communism. The idea of the social revolution will not be sufficient to carry them away. The Socialist idea, the Communist idea, is powerful enough to guide and order the successive efforts of the proletariat. The masses organize themselves and fight in order that they may draw nearer every day to that ideal, and realize it by gradual stages. But the idea of the revolution must embody itself in definite claims, if a great agitation is to arise."

Jaurès observes that the leaders of the new school are tricking the workers, by suggesting that they should strike in order to obtain certain concrete and definite reforms, while hoping and expecting that they will be irresistibly drawn into a revolution which will shake the foundations of society. He warns the working class that there is only one sovereign method of attaining the triumph of Socialism. That method is to gain the support of the majority of voters by legitimate means. He warns the capitalists that for them the policy of the general strike is a menace which they dare not disregard. If any attempt were made to withdraw from the masses such political rights and privileges as they possess, then indeed "the general strike accompanied with violence would be the spontaneous form of the working class revolt, a kind of last and desperate resource, a means of striking the enemy rather than of saving themselves."

Karl Kautsky

Léon de Seilhac calls Kautsky "a great doctor of Socialism, a theologian of the first rank in orthodox Marxism."¹ His pronouncements, in the opinion of this French critic, have something at times of the mysterious uncertainty of Sibylline prophecies. German Socialists have devoted their attention, as Lagardelle

¹ *Le Monde Socialiste*, p. 140.

reminds us, to the general strike in its political rather than its economic aspects. Leaders such as Kautsky, Rosa Luxemburg and Bernstein have approved such a strike as a vast political demonstration. Kautsky, however, has pointed out in clearest language the perils which would attend a universal economic strike.

"We must not forget," he says, "that a general strike does not put a stop only to capitalistic production; while it lasts it puts a stop to all production.

"Now it is much more in the interest of the workers than of the capitalists that production should go on; for the capitalists are not only in possession of the means of production, they also have at their disposal all the great supplies of objects of consumption. Therefore they are able to bear a general stoppage of production much more easily than the workers can. The workers are completely powerless to starve them out. . . .

"If the victory is not won within the first week, the provisions of the workers are exhausted and also those of the small shopkeepers who are their creditors. They have then no choice except to submit or to resort to extra-legal means, to take possession by force of the means of subsistence. In doing so, however, they would forsake the ground of the economic strike, the revolution with folded arms, for that of insurrection."¹

Kautsky is thinking of the strike for some great political object when he says: "I am fully in accord with those words of Adler: 'I do not approve of our giving to our opponents the assurance, which is so soothing for them, that there will be no general strike. That would be to encourage dangerous illusions. We do not wish to renounce the idea of the general strike. But the question when, how and why it will break out, belongs to the domain of the future.'"

Émile Vandervelde

The fullest statement of the Belgian leader's views on the general strike is contained in an article which was published in May of last year in French and German.² We quote from this rather than from the earlier article in Prof. Lagardelle's volume.

¹ *La Grève Générale*, p. 224.

² In the *Revue du Mois*, Paris, and the *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft*, May 1908.

M. Vandervelde discusses the political strike in its reformist and its revolutionary aspects. He notes, to begin with, that the true general strike, *i.e.* the cessation of labour by all the workers in all the industries of a country or district is a mere theoretical conception. "In practice, we speak of a general strike, if many labourers in the leading industries stop work. Thus, for example, out of about 800,000 Belgian workers, there were only 200,000 strikers in 1893 and over 300,000 in 1902, when the question at issue was that of manhood suffrage. In Sweden, where the [first] general strike was not so much a means of pressure as a demonstration on an imposing scale in favour of manhood suffrage, the number of the strikers was very considerable. "In Stockholm there was not only a stoppage in the factories and building trades, but the electric railways, gas-works and businesses connected with transport were involved in the strike. No middle-class newspaper could appear. Notwithstanding this, the number of wage-earners over the whole country who did not strike was much larger than the number of strikers." ¹

Looking back on the so-called "general strikes" for political or social reforms, Vandervelde notes certain characteristics which were common to them all.

(1) In the first place, they were very short. They hardly ever lasted more than a week, and during that time the strikers lived chiefly on their savings. Industries associated with food provision have rarely or only in a slight degree been drawn into the strikes.

(2) Secondly, all these strikes were undertaken only for objects which the whole working-class community ardently desired.

(3) Again, the demands of the workers were never of such a nature that the foundations of capitalistic rule would have been shaken if they had been granted. A larger or smaller section of the bourgeois classes have always been among the supporters of these strikes in recent years.

(4) Fourthly, these general strikes have had a more or less complete success only when they were declared suddenly, when the Governments on which it was desired to put pressure were taken by surprise, and when the middle classes did not oppose the strikers.

¹ *Archiv*, May 1908, p. 542.

Turning to the general strike as understood by the leaders of revolutionary Syndicalism, M. Vandervelde expresses sympathy with those who are impatient with the results achieved by direct Parliamentary action. He thinks that Socialists ought to work not only through Parliament, but through the trades-unions.¹ He refuses to identify the social revolution with the general strike.

Pablo Iglesias

The problem of the general strike has been much discussed among Socialists in Spain, and M. Lagardelle was able to include in his inquiry the views of two well-known representatives of the party in that country—Pablo Iglesias and Anselmo Lorenzo.

Pablo Iglesias points out that in the case of a general strike, the workers would not be able to attain their ends simply by "folding their arms." They would be plunged at once into a revolution. Their task would be to deliver the final attack on the fortress of privilege and to put an end to the rule of the oppressors of the poor.

"It will not do," remarks Iglesias, "to say that this result may be attained equally well by the general strike. The strike is merely the refusal to work and nothing more. If the supporters of this method desire that the working classes, after having been drawn far in this direction by economic action and political action, should have recourse to revolutionary methods, to the use of violence, in order that they may gain the upper hand, let them declare their real aim frankly, instead of talking about a general strike. The truth is, that the partisans of the strike, or at least the greater number of them, hardly care at all about the social revolution in the modern sense of the word. The best proof of this is that they are not thinking about any of those things which are necessary in order to prepare for it. The real object they have in view, under the pretext of organizing general strikes, is to drive the workers into using revolutionary methods at the wrong season, that is to say, at a time when the majority of the proletariat have not yet attained consciousness of their own interests, and when they have neither the union nor the organization which are indispensable to them."²

¹ *Archiv*, May 1908, p. 558.

² *Enquête*, pp. 319, 320.

The Spanish leader adds that in his own country it is the Anarchists who are in favour of the general strike. When an ordinary strike broke out in a town or a district in which many of them were living—a strike which had for its object an increase of wages or a diminution of the daily hours of work—they took such measures that a conflict attended with violence soon occurred between the men and their masters. The Anarchists hoped that this shock would suffice to kindle the spark which would ultimately produce the social revolution. They have sought consistently to broaden out and extend every partial strike; they have opposed peace negotiations and have objected also to the accumulation of even the smallest strike funds.

“Their real wish is that the workmen, rendered desperate by famine and by the refusal of the employers to grant the whole of their demands, should be driven to methods of violence.”

“What have been the results,” asks Iglesias, “of the attempts which have been made towards the general strike? All have been disastrous. There has not been a single success in any case, and there has always been much harm done to the workers’ cause.” As an example, he quotes the case of the famous general strike in Barcelona in 1902, which was worked up by the Anarchists. “Among these thousands of workmen, there was neither unity of thought nor plan nor guidance. . . . The only result of that attempt was that blood was shed in several encounters between the workmen and the police, that some were killed and a great many imprisoned.”

Iglesias pronounces the idea of a general international strike “a dream,” adding that it is mischievous to spread such teaching, because it impels the workers to the commission of acts which are contrary to their class interests.”

He concludes as follows—

“Let us develop to the utmost the working-class movement, alike in the political and in the economic sense; and we shall prepare the ground not for a time when the masses shall fold their arms, but when, by revolutionary methods, they shall snatch the power from the capitalist class.”

Anselmo Lorenzo

Lorenzo expresses the mind of the militant section of Spanish Socialists, especially in Catalonia. In his opinion, the leadership of Socialism in the new century is falling largely into the hands of men who use its propaganda to further their own ambitious ends. The intense bitterness at the heart of revolutionary Syndicalism finds expression in his utterances. The officials of the party, he thinks, are ignoring that fundamental principle, "the emancipation of the workers should be achieved by the workers themselves." They are selfish opportunists who have but one principle in common, viz. that their supporters ought to maintain them as members of parliament. Such leaders, in their involved and labyrinthine arguments against the general strike, really mean nothing more than this: "Let us enjoy the privileges associated with the position of M.P., and we will labour gradually for your emancipation." All such men, says Lorenzo, are false friends of the proletariat. Some of them are lazy ex-workmen who hate honest labour. Others are the sons of well-to-do citizens, who take up Socialism from motives of ambition. All have their own axe to grind while they profess to be serving the people.

It may be admitted that there is much shrewd criticism in the attacks made by revolutionary writers on some of the officials of the party. The ex-working-man who frequents fashionable hotels and appears at *table d'hôte* in evening dress, while fellow-guests murmur, "That is the great Socialist, Mr. So-and-so," is in the eyes of the Syndicalists an even more odious figure than the multi-millionaire. In the day of revolution, such "moderates" might receive as short shrift from the "militants" as Danton and Camille Desmoulins received from Robespierre.

The Spanish proletariat, according to Lorenzo, has already been well instructed in Socialism. "The works of Fourier and of Cabet, which were translated and edited after 1840, were widely known in Andalusia. Proudhon was perhaps better known and more popular in Spain than in France."

"The general strike," says Lorenzo, "appears to us like a vast, united, instantaneous and spontaneous act on the part of the

workers. Its object is not to demand better conditions from the masters; but to do away with mastership by expropriating the expropriators of social wealth and by exchanging the present system of wages for a system of solidarity and general well-being."

Lorenzo refuses to accept the argument that in a general strike the workers would be the first to suffer because the prices of the most necessary commodities would rise to such a height that only the rich could obtain them.

"When that moment comes, money will lose its claim to be the means of procuring the things necessary to life, and as it cannot be eaten, those who still believe in its virtue will be in danger of dying of hunger. Then the triumphant proletariat, when the machinery of government has been broken to pieces, when military discipline has been put out of gear and each soldier is once more a free man, will be like the crew of a shipwrecked vessel who land upon an island richly furnished by nature, where each man can realize that inherent right to live which he carries within himself. The natural feeling of solidarity will of its own impulse create a new society, not on the hateful foundations of the old, but on those which the great thinkers traced out, and which the workers have foreseen and prepared by a long period of organization, struggle, propaganda and sacrifices."¹

Filippo Turati

The Italian reformist, Filippo Turati, occupies himself with the consideration of the general strike as a political weapon, "a solemn manifestation of the people's will." Such a strike, if it were to have any chance of success, must, in his opinion, be brief. It must have a definite object which can be attained with comparative ease. It must be well organized and disciplined by leaders who possess the confidence of the masses.

"Brevity above all is essential, in view of the fact that the stoppage of production would injure the strikers themselves in the first place because their wages would cease. The working classes have small savings and hardly any credit. The sacrifices which the strike imposes upon them must last as short a time as possible.

¹ *Enquête*, p. 333.

Any long continuance would inevitably produce desertions, and as a result conflicts between the workers. This would give a fine opportunity for the intervention of armed force with all that follows."

Turati thinks that the important public services should be left untouched by the strikers, also everything belonging to the primary needs of society, such as lighting, water-supply, bakeries, etc.

Generally speaking, the moderate Socialist leaders take the view that for some great political object a general strike might, in the last resort, be a permissible and an effective weapon for the masses, but they give no encouragement to the so-called "economic" strike, which would end in a crushing defeat of the anarchical rioters who were seeking to bring in the new era by revolutionary violence. Among the extremers there are some, like Lafargue, who object to the general strike solely on the ground that the revolution, in their view, could be carried through more successfully by other means.

Dutch Leaders

Socialism in Holland has a strong Syndicalist element. From its earliest days, as Robert Hunter truly says, "The Dutch movement has been agitated by those of an Anarchist tendency; and because of their hostile attitude there was recently great danger of a disruption of the party. "Het Volk" was charged with becoming lax in Marxian principles and with favouring revisionism. However, after a long dispute and much personal bitterness, the overwhelming majority of the members have supported the central committee in a resolution demanding that the criticism of the Syndicalist action should be kept within reasonable limits; and at the Congress of 1907 the malcontents submitted, a fact that has considerably brightened the outlook for Socialism in the Netherlands."¹

The question of the general strike has been eagerly discussed by both sections. Within the limits of the Dutch Social Democratic Party, which was founded in 1894, and which stands apart from the Syndicalists, there have been in recent years two strongly-

¹ *Socialists at Work*, p. 347.

marked lines of opinion. The first, represented by Van Kol and Vliegen, has opposed the general strike under any form and for any purpose. The second, represented by that able writer, Henriette Roland-Holst, whose contributions to *Die Neue Zeit* on this subject may be recommended, has approved the general strike as a political weapon only. At the Dordrecht Congress of 1904 the latter view was accepted by the majority of delegates.

In summing up the opinions he had collected, Prof. Lagardelle remarked that the general strike, as conceived by men like Turati and Bernstein, differs as widely from the revolutionary general strike "as their trade-unionist conception of the action of the *syndicats* differs from the Revolutionary Syndicalist movement."¹

V

PROSPECTS OF THE PARTY OF VIOLENCE

The Syndicalists call upon the trades-unions to take forcible possession of the means of production, to do away with the present system of State government, and to establish the reign of free co-operative labour. The influence of these leaders was strikingly manifested during the recent postal disturbances in Paris, but the fiasco of May reassured many French citizens who had supposed that the General Confederation of Labour, during the fourteen years of its existence, had succeeded in capturing the entire Labour world. M. Niel, who succeeded M. Griffuelhes as secretary of the Confederation, confessed during the crisis that he did not believe the workers were yet ready for a general strike. He was not prepared, it seems, to realize the "Nero-dream" of universal joy and enthusiasm on the part of the populace, while hideous scenes were going on.

What are the immediate prospects of Revolutionary Syndicalism, as the term is understood in the Latin countries? In a recent article,² Hubert Lagardelle adopts a hopeful and confident tone.

¹ *Enquête*, p. 418.

² No II. of a short series published in the *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft*, vol. xxvi, May 1908, pp. 606-648. In this article Lagardelle is careful to separate the cause he champions from that of the Anarchists.

He points to the fact that the C.G.T. has recently obtained a home of its own, "*La Maison des Fédérations*," and he argues that the Confederation has exercised a considerable influence on the social life of France. He writes contemptuously of the "yellow" trades-unions, which maintain friendly relations with the employers. Many of the employers, he says, "have made enormous sacrifices in order to support the 'yellow' unions which are to work against the 'red.' They would rather spend money in keeping up newspapers and paying agitators whose business it will be to create divisions among the working classes, than run the risk of strikes or tolerate the Syndicalistic claims. We do not believe that they have had much opportunity for satisfaction up to the present with this 'yellow' movement, which is of no importance, precisely because it is artificially cultivated. It may well happen that most of the employers who support the 'yellows'¹ may one day find that this subsidy is unprofitable and too expensive in proportion to the returns."

"The Syndicalists," adds Lagardelle, "would welcome with their whole hearts the creation of a fighting organization of the employers, which would draw into one body all similar organisations. They believe that in this way the class-conflict would be brought into a clearer light and that the proletariat would then also gain a more distinct self-consciousness."

Men of Lagardelle's school repel all philanthropy, all kindness on the part of the masters. They prefer employers who are determined to defend their rights and who treat the proletariat frankly as enemies.

In concluding the article from which we have quoted, Lagardelle reminds his readers that the movement is still young and should be judged to-day rather by its aims than by its achievements. The most hopeful signs of recent years, to his mind, have been the

¹ Lagardelle explains in a note to this article in the *Archiv* (p. 647) that the term "the yellows" had its origin in 1901 during the great strike at Montceau-les-Mines. At that time the workmen who favoured a compromise separated from the trades-unions and formed one of their own. The other strikers, who considered this as an act of treason, attacked the café in which the more moderate men held their meetings and broke all the window-panes. Next day the holes were stopped up with yellow paper, and the members of "Syndicat No. 2" were forthwith called in mockery "The Yellows." Since then all unions which are friendly to the capitalists have borne this designation.

many industrial strikes and the steady growth of anti-militarism among the working classes.

Although the revolutionary movement, through its able champions, makes a good deal of noise in the world, it has a feeble hold on the French working classes generally. As Mermeix has pointed out, the trades-unions which belong to the "General Confederation of Labour" represent less than half the trades-unions in France. In 1906, according to the official figures, the number of trades-unions was 4,857 with a membership of 836,134. Victor Griffuelhes, in his report to the Congress of Amiens in October of the same year, gave the number of unions belonging to the *Confédération Générale du Travail* as 2,399, with a membership of 203,273.¹

Mermeix draws up the following tabular statement—

Total number of industrial trade-unions in France	4,857
Number adhering to the C.G.T.	2,399
Difference	2,458
Number of workmen belonging to trades-unions	836,134
Number of adherents of the C.G.T.	203,273
Difference	632,861

The trades-unionists adhering to the Confederation represent, according to these figures, scarcely one-fourth of the total number of trades-unionists in France.²

It must further be remembered that out of the total number of industrial workers in France (roughly estimated by Mermeix at five millions), less than one million belong to unions of any kind.

Mermeix says: "Out of the whole number of French [industrial] workers only sixteen out of every hundred are unionists. . . . That proportion declines by three-quarters for the confederated unionists. . . . The proportion for them falls to 5 per cent. . . . Therefore, out of every hundred French workmen, there are

¹ Émile Pouget, in his small work published last year, *La Confédération du Travail*, claims that 350,000 organized workers belong to the C.G.T.

² *Le Syndicalisme contre le Socialisme*, pp. 216, 217.

ninety-five who ignore the Confederation and five only (we take our figures from the report of its secretary) whom it claims as adherents.”¹

Some of the unions which belong to the C.G.T. are, as Mermeix shows, slack in paying the small subscriptions required of them, and in subscribing to the party organ, *La Voix du Peuple*. M. Lévy, the treasurer, estimated in 1906 that out of 2,361 unions, only 947 subscribed to the federal paper.²

“In some corporations that journal even appears to be boycotted. Thus the railways have 176 trades-unions, and only fifteen pay the subscription. The posts and telegraphs furnish nine subscriptions only out of ninety-three groups. . . . *La Voix du Peuple* is not taken in by half the unions, although, according to a decision of the Congress of Montpellier, subscription to it is obligatory.”

It must be acknowledged that the working-class leaders of the movement do not make large profits. Their time is spent in going up and down the country on propaganda business, and the sums allotted in the treasurer's accounts for their expenses are very small. The chief mischief done by the C.G.T. has been the attempt to turn aside the trades-unions from their legitimate functions and to transform them into instruments of class war. It would be a mistake, however, to exaggerate its influence. The immense majority of the workers stand outside its control.

M. Vandervelde has remarked on the mystical strain which runs through much of Sorel's teaching. “It is indisputable,” he says, “that for the Revolutionary Syndicalists the idea of the general strike is the Alpha and Omega of revolutionary activity, that for them the whole of Socialism is included in it. Practical objections are useless. In vain we point out to them that in a country like France there exist not only the proletariat and the capitalists, but also an enormous middle class, *i.e.* the peasants, and that the social revolution would therefore be possible only with the help of this class, or at least on condition of its neutrality.”³

¹ *Le Syndicalisme contre le Socialisme*, p. 218.

² *Ibid.* p. 223

³ *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft*, May 1908, p. 557.

Sorel and his disciples regard the general strike as a "mythos" which gathers into itself all the aspirations of Socialism, and which is capable of arousing in the working classes the spirit of self-sacrifice and strength for lofty endeavour. "Strikes," says Sorel, have called forth in the masses the noblest, deepest and most practically effective feelings which they possess. The general strike draws these together into a grand whole, and raises each to the highest point of intensity."

It is not enough, according to the Syndicalists, that the oppressed masses should dream of a deliverance in the future. They must have some conception of the method in which the age-long struggle with their enemies will terminate. They must hear the shouting of the battle and see the garments rolled in blood.

The leaders of Syndicalism ignore all the beneficent processes of history. They do not understand how immense an advance has been made in the path of human progress. According to their view, the working classes are in a desperate position, from which they can be rescued only by deeds of violence. There is no saviour on earth or in heaven, therefore the proletariat must achieve its own emancipation. Fierce and desperate fighting, a true Neronian orgy, may precede the final deliverance. For such an outcome these cultured philosophers are prepared. It is easy to denounce them as criminals of the most contemptible type—men who sit at home in ease and comfort while inciting others to wickedness, criminals of the type of Claudius in *Hamlet*, who assail the life of the body politic by poison "swift as quicksilver" poured into the ears of unsuspecting men. But every careful student of the periodical literature of Syndicalism must recognize, with Werner Sombart, that there is a better side to its teaching, and that its ghastly errors are sometimes the exaggeration of a noble idealism. Especially must we sympathize with these writers in their appeal to the self-reliance and personal energy of the working classes, and in their distrust of a childlike dependence on the State. The lesson, "cease from man," has never been taught more impressively than by Georges Sorel and his associates, but because these men refuse to acknowledge the guiding hand of God in human history, their doctrines lead us to the darkest pessimism.

There is a story told by Liebknecht in his *Memoirs of Marx*,

which he himself may possibly have applied to the wider field of human effort, and which we may venture to quote as an illustration of the providential guidance of world reform.

Liebknacht, who came to London as an exiled ex-prisoner in 1850, was received as a welcome guest in the home of Karl Marx; and the stalwart young German soon won the affection of Marx's little daughters, Jenny and Laura, who called him by the pet name "Library." On the day of the Duke of Wellington's funeral, Liebknacht was persuaded, against his own better judgment, to take the children to see the procession. Frau Marx, who appreciated the soldierly qualities and tender-heartedness of a countryman who had already suffered for his principles, entrusted her little girls to his charge without anxiety. Karl Marx, the "Mohr" of the family circle, had probably no conception of the danger they were incurring. We tell the story in Liebknacht's own words—

"I had formed my plan. We had no money to hire a place at a window or on a stand. The funeral procession was to pass through the Strand, in a line with the Thames. We must go into one of the side-streets which turn off the Strand to the north and fall back a little from the river. With one of the girls holding each hand, and with provisions in my pocket, I made my way to a point of view—not far from Temple Bar—which I had selected for our purpose. . . . It turned out to be perfectly suitable. I stood on a stairway, and the two girls, who clung closely together, and whom I held firmly each by one hand, were behind me on the upper step.

"Hark! There was a movement in the human sea—a distant growing noise, like the dull roar of the ocean. It came nearer and nearer. An 'Ah!' burst from thousands upon thousands of throats. The procession was there; we could see it splendidly from our position, as if we had been sitting in the theatre. The children were in raptures. No crushing—all my anxieties were dispelled.

"It was a long, long procession, glittering with gold, with the vast and magnificent catafalque which bore 'the conqueror of Napoleon' to his tomb. New sights went ceaselessly by us—more and more of them—till at length there came the end. The last gold-laced rider had vanished. And now suddenly there comes a strong push, an onrushing of the multitude heaped up

behind us. Every one wants to follow the procession. I resist with all my strength. I try to cover the children, so that the stream shall rush by without touching them. In vain. No human power can avail against the elemental strength of the crowd. . . . I am *forced* to give way, and, pressing the children tightly to me, I try to escape out of the main current. I have almost succeeded, and have drawn a breath of relief when suddenly from the right a new and more powerful human wave breaks in. We are whirled into the Strand; and the thousands and hundreds of thousands who have collected in this great main artery want to rush after the procession, so that they may enjoy the spectacle a second time. I clench my teeth, I try to lift the children to my shoulders, but I am too tightly squeezed in. I clasp the girls' arms convulsively, the whirlwind tears us on, and all at once I feel that some force is thrusting itself between me and the children. With each hand I clutch one of their wrists, but the force which is thrusting itself between me and the children presses in like a wedge—the children are torn from me. No resistance avails. I had to let them go, or I should have broken their arms or torn them out of the sockets. It was a horrible moment!

"What was I do? Before me rose the gate of Temple Bar with its three passages—that in the middle for carriages and horses, and on the sides for foot-passengers. The human stream had heaped itself up against the walls of this gate, like water against the piers of a bridge. I must get through! If only the children had not been trampled to the ground—and the despairing shrieks of terror around revealed to me the full danger—then I might hope to find them on the other side, where the massing of the multitude must cease. Oh, if only—— I worked like a madman with my breast and elbows. But in such a crowd the individual is like a straw which floats in the eddy. I fought and fought—a dozen times I thought I was in the passage and was again thrust outside. At last there came a push, a fearful squeeze—and in a moment I was on the other side and out of the fiercest crush. I searched—hurrying hither and thither. I saw nothing! My heart almost stopped beating. All at once, two clear child-voices called me: 'Library!' I thought I was dreaming. That was angels' music. And before me stood the two girls, smiling and uninjured. I kissed them and pressed them to me. For a moment I could not speak. Then they told me that the human wave which had torn them from me had carried them safely through the gate and then cast them aside, under the protection of these very walls which on the other side had caused the

swell of people. . . . We returned home in triumph. . . . The children had no suspicion of the danger in which they had been involved. They had enjoyed themselves perfectly. And I told nothing that evening of the fearful quarter of an hour through which I had passed."¹

We cannot wonder that to the end of his days Liebknecht recalled that experience with a shudder. He would have given his life for the children, but the task of their rescue was taken out of his hands. Is not the story a true parable of the ways of God in social progress? Loyal and brave men have striven in this cause with all the forces of their being, and have often seemed to strive in vain. The fortress of selfishness has seemed impregnable. They have been overwhelmed by the awful pressure and maddened by the cries of despair. Then, when the fighter's strength was exhausted, some strange, unaccountable impulse has carried humanity forward. The worst has turned the best to the brave. Through the dark gates of history, beset with a thousand enemies, God has opened a way for the poor.

¹ *Karl Marx zum Gedächtniss*, von W. Liebknecht, pp. 79-81. (Wörlein & Co. Nürnberg. 1896.)

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS OF AMERICAN SOCIALISM

I

HISTORICAL NOTES

THE writer of the article on "Socialism," in the *New International Encyclopædia*,¹ observes that although Communism gained an early foothold in the United States, it exercised practically no influence upon the movement now represented by the Socialist parties.

"American Socialism proper begins with the German influence. As a result of the political disorders of 1848, many men of learning and character came to this country from Germany as refugees. There were Radicals among them who took the leadership in the establishment of Communism of a new type in this country."

The most celebrated of these refugees was Wilhelm Weitling, a tailor, who started a German newspaper called *Die Republik der Arbeiter*, and organized an *Arbeiterbund*.

The German *Turnvereine*, or gymnastic unions, were in the early days avowedly Socialist. In 1850 the name "Socialist Gymnastic Union" was adopted, but after the Civil War these associations gradually lost their Socialistic character.

"The first Socialist political party on a national scope organized on American soil," says Morris Hillquit, "was the Social Democratic Working Men's Party, called into life on the 4th day of July, 1874. This party, together with several other then-existing Socialist organizations, merged into the Working Men's Party of the United States in 1876. It was this party, which had in the mean-

¹ Vol. xviii. pp. 298-300. (Dodd, Mead & Co. New York.)

while changed its name to the Socialist Labour Party of North America, which maintained the undisputed hegemony in the Socialist movement during twenty-three years, and was largely instrumental in laying the foundation of the present Socialist movement in this country. In 1892 the Socialists of the United States for the first time nominated a presidential ticket, and they have since that time invariably adhered to the policy of independent politics, steadfastly refusing to ally themselves with any other political parties.”¹

American Socialists had much trouble in earlier years with the Anarchist section of their party. At the New York Convention of the Socialist Labour Party, held in 1881, the Anarchists revolted against the main body. Justus Schwab and Johann Most became the active agitators of this section. At the Baltimore Convention of 1883, the Socialists definitely separated themselves from the Anarchists.

On the slow advance of Socialism in the United States, we may again quote that eminent authority, Morris Hillquit. In his book published this year he says—

“Notwithstanding the untiring efforts and persistent propaganda of the Socialist Labour Party, the growth of the Socialist movement in the United States was exceedingly slow and entirely out of keeping with that of the movement in other countries. As a matter of fact, the movement was largely borne by foreign working-men, principally Germans, and until the end of last century it did not succeed in acquiring a foothold in the broad masses of the native population; but during the last decade a number of circumstances have combined to insure a more favourable reception to the gospel of Socialism in the United States. The rapid industrial development of the country, accompanied by the growth of gigantic trusts and powerful labour-unions, the growing intensity of the overt struggles between capital and labour, and the collapse of the populist and other reform movements, all served to prepare the soil for the Socialist seed.”²

Mr. Hillquit explains how the present Socialist Party branched off from the Socialist Labour Party, and absorbed the greater number of its associates.

“The Socialist Party,” he goes on, “has at this time (1909)

¹ *Socialism in Theory and Practice* (1909), pp. 352, 353.

² *Op. cit.* p. 353.

about 3,200 local organizations in the different States and Territories of the Union, with a dues-paying membership of about 50,000. It polled a vote of 423,969 in the presidential election of 1908."¹

America, as Professor Flint remarks, has had in Henry George, Laurence Gronlund, and Edward Bellamy, three exceptionally interesting representatives of Socialism. Dr. Flint, writing in 1894, said that "contemporary American Socialism has been mainly derived from Germany," but, as we shall see later on, the twentieth-century American Socialist is, as a rule, native-born.²

The most noted living American Socialist is Eugene V. Debs, the former President of the American Railway Workers' Union, who suffered imprisonment for his conduct in the Pullman strike of 1894. He is the leader of the "Social Democratic Party," founded in 1898. The party's original plan was to found in the State of Washington, on the western coast, a Socialist community, which would presently seize upon the State Government, and revolutionize the social and economic system. In the same way, every State in the Union was to be revolutionized one after the other. "The scheme never got beyond the enlistment of recruits, to the number of about 25,000. It fell through from legal obstacles, and partly from lack of funds; but it is not abandoned."³

Although the American Socialist press includes more than fifty periodicals, no Socialist member has yet been returned to Congress. In the State legislatures and municipal councils the party has won some striking victories. The Rev. Charles Stelzle, superintendent of the Labour Department of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, expressed the opinion, during a recent visit to London, that Socialism, which made rapid progress between 1900 and 1904, has since that time fallen into a state of comparative stagnation. He gave, as an example, the fact that Chicago polled in 1908 only one-third of the votes which were cast for the Socialist ticket in 1904, although there is now a Socialist daily paper for the city.

¹ *Socialism in Theory and Practice* (1909), p. 354.

² *Socialism*, p. 35, Note.

³ Rae, *Contemporary Socialism*, p. 543. Edition of 1901.

Mr. Robert Hunter, in his new volume *Socialists at Work*,¹ remarks that there are many things which would account for what might be called the backwardness of the Socialist movement in America.

"It might be said that the transition from a comparatively prosperous state of affairs to one of industrial anarchy, with its concomitant of surplus labour, has been too swift to allow of the people acquiring that spirit of class-consciousness out of which have grown the Socialist movements of Europe. And, with its 'democratic' institutions, there has been no such common cause as the fight for the suffrage, which has been so much of a unifying and educational force among the proletariat of other countries. Again, the vastness of the country has been a great drawback. There has certainly not been union among the Socialists themselves, but it is very easy to overstate the retarding effect of such want of unity. Undoubtedly the principal obstacle has been that, while numerous exotic Socialist societies have sprung up during the last fifty years as a consequence of the presence in America of a population of widely different nationalities, the very difference of language and characteristics of the immigrants has militated against a union of the workers. Even when they have been brought together in trades-unions, they displayed, up to quite recently, a positively hostile attitude towards political action. So that, fully considered, it must be said that in face of such formidable difficulties, in what they have accomplished up to the present, the Socialists of America have done remarkably good work."

The Presidential Election of 1908

In the *International Socialist Review* for June 1908, Max S. Hayes asked—

"Why shouldn't the Socialist Party roll up a million votes in 1908? . . . Debs and Hanford ought to poll at least a million votes. And what would not a million votes signify? A million Socialist votes would throw the fear of God into the hearts of every plutocratic tyrant and trust oppressor in the United States. . . . A million Socialist votes would cause the old dry bones at Washington to rattle as they have not rattled since the election of Lincoln! . . . A million Socialist votes would sound as the thunderous roar of an

¹ *Socialists at Work*, by Robert Hunter. (The Macmillan Company, New York, 1909.)

awakening working class in the ears of the Parrys and Posts and Van Cleaves and compel them to scurry for cover to avoid retributive lightning. A million Socialist votes would blanch the cheeks of every Pinkerton thug and Hessian hireling and pronounce the doom of the strike-breaking industry. . . . A million Socialist votes would sound the tocsin that the working class had repudiated the Pharaoh of capitalism and was preparing to march into the Promised Land of the co-operative commonwealth.”¹

An American correspondent of *Die Neue Zeit*, Mr. Algernon Lee, wrote a few months ago in that magazine on the results of the election of 1908: ² “We can hardly maintain,” he remarked, “that the results of the voting are very satisfactory for us, but at the same time the feeling of deep disappointment which prevailed in many Socialist circles immediately after the election has now given place to a calmer judgment and to the consequent firm resolve to do better next time.”

In earlier articles (October 16 and 23, 1908), Mr. Lee had mentioned that many bourgeois journals were prophesying at that time that the Socialist poll in November would reach a million, and that the more optimistically-disposed enthusiasts among Socialists themselves shared this hope.

“I explained that this prophecy was exaggerated, and said that we might be well satisfied if we had 750,000 votes. This would mean an increase of 85 per cent. upon our pollings of 1904. Even this hope, as events have proved, was much too sanguine. In reality the number of votes cast for the candidates of the Socialist Party increased only from 402,321 in the year 1904 to 420,464 in the year 1908. If we include the Territories, whose inhabitants have no share in the election for President and Vice-President, but who choose delegates for Congress, the total poll of the Socialist Party increased from 408,230 to 423,969—an advance of less than 4 per cent.”

Mr. Lee points out that the proportion of the figures was notably affected by the fact that Oklahoma, which in 1904 was still a Territory with 4,443 Socialist votes, had in the meanwhile become a State, which in 1898 registered 21,779 votes for Debs and Hanford. Oklahoma, he says, was one of the few States or

¹ Vol. viii. pp. 789, 790.

² *Die Neue Zeit*, March 5, 1909.

Territories in which the Socialist vote was conspicuously increased.

The conditions of November 1908 are considered by this writer to have been much less favourable for the Socialists than those of 1904. "In that year the Democratic Party was publicly controlled by the plutocracy, and discontented voters had no escape except into the Socialist camp."

"Perhaps we ought to be content with what has been achieved, in view of the facts that since the election there has been no setback in the party activity, that the number of members has kept on growing, that the public meetings of the party have been as crowded since November as they were before, that its principles are receiving full consideration not only in the newspapers and magazines of all shades and in all intellectual circles, but among the ranks of organized workers; while the party press—and this is the most important fact of all—is constantly extending its circulation and gaining new influence from day to day."

II

AN AMERICAN SOCIALIST LECTURER: MR. JOHN SPARGO

One of the most interesting of recent American books written from a frankly Socialist standpoint is John Spargo's *Socialism*.¹ It was recommended to the writer with high appreciation by the Rev. Charles Stelzle. Mr. Spargo's volume is intended rather for the general reader than for the student. He remarks in the preface: "If the critical reader finds portions of the book somewhat discursive, owing to the weaving-in of much biographical material relating to Owen, Marx and others, I venture to hope that the gain in human interest will atone for an otherwise inexcusable failing."

Mr. Spargo has been for twelve years a popular lecturer on Socialism, and he tells us that he has adopted in his book the method of presentation which he has found most effective in his work as a lecturer. His writings are well worth examining by those who watch the literature of the American Socialist platform.

¹ First published in 1906, this book is in its third edition (1909). (Macmillan. New York.)

"Time was, and not so very long ago," he begins, "when the kindest conception of Socialism held by the average man was that of the once familiar and cynical doggerel—

"What is a Socialist? One who is willing
To give up his penny and pocket your shilling."¹

"There was another view, more brutally unkind, that of the blood-curdling cartoon representing the poor Socialist as a bomb-laden assassin. Both these views are now, happily, well-nigh extinct. Great as the ignorance of people concerning Socialism still is, we have progressed so far that neither of these puerile misrepresentations is commonly met with. . . . It is the exception rather than the rule to encounter these criticisms, and they do not represent the attitude of the mass of people towards the Socialist movement."

"The word 'Socialism,'" says Mr. Spargo, "is spoken by many with the pallid lips of fear, the scowl of hate, or the amused shrug of contempt; while in the same land, people of the same race, facing the same problems and perils, speak of it with gladdened voices and hopeful eyes. Many a mother crooning over her babe prays that it may be saved from the Socialism to which another, with equal mother-love, looks as her child's heritage and hope."

On the question of Socialism and agriculture in America, John Spargo has some instructive remarks.

"When we turn to agriculture, the criticisms of the Socialist theory of concentration appear more substantial and important. A few years ago we witnessed the rise and rapid growth of the great bonanza farms in this country. It was shown that the advantages of large capital as the consolidation of productive forces resulted, in farming and in manufacture, in greatly cheapened production. The end of the small farm was declared to be imminent, and it seemed for a while that concentration in agriculture would even outrun concentration in manufacture. This predicted absorption of the small farms by the larger, and the average increase of farm acreage, has not, however, been fulfilled to any great degree. An increase in the number of small farms, and a decrease in the average acreage is shown in almost all the States. The increase of great estates shown by the census figures probably bears little or no relation to real farming, consisting mainly of great stock grazing ranches in the West, and unproductive gentle-

¹ Ebenezer Elliott.

men's estates in the East. Apparently then, the Socialist theory that the 'big fish eat up the little ones' is not applicable to agriculture. On the contrary, it seems that the great wheat ranch cannot compete with the smaller farm."¹

Mr. Spargo, it is true, hesitates to agree with Prof. Werner Sombart and Prof. Ely that the Marxian system breaks down when it reaches the sphere of agricultural industry, because, "small agricultural holdings do not necessarily imply economic independence any more than do petty industries or businesses."

"When we examine the census figures carefully, the first important fact which challenges attention is the decrease of independent farm ownership, and a corresponding increase in tenantry. Of the 5,739,657 farms in the United States in the census year, 2,026,286 were operated by tenants. In 1880, 71.6 per cent. of the farms in the United States were operated by their owners, while in 1900 the proportion had fallen to 64.7 per cent. Concerning the ownership of these rented farms, little investigation has been made, and it is probable that careful inquiry into the subject would elicit the fact that this forms a not unimportant aspect of agricultural concentration, although it is not recorded by the census figures."

In his closing pages, Mr. Spargo attempts to outline the Socialist State.

"Absolute individual liberty," he says, "is incompatible with social liberty. The liberty of each must, in Mill's phrase, be bounded by the like liberty of all. Absolute personal liberty is a chimera, a delusion."²

On the marriage question he remarks—

"Other Socialists would include in the category of private acts outside the sphere of law, the union of the sexes. They would do away with legal intervention in marriage, and make it exclusively a private concern. On the other hand, again, many Socialists, probably an overwhelming majority, would object. They would insist that the State must, in the interest of the children, and for its own self-preservation, assume certain responsibilities for, and exercise a certain control over, all marriages. While believing that under Socialism marriage would

¹ *Socialism*, pp. 108, 109.

² *Ibid.* p. 214.

no longer be subject to economic motives—matrimonial markets for titles and fortunes no longer existing—and that the maximum of personal freedom, together with the minimum of social authority, would be possible in the union of the sexes, they would still insist upon the necessity of that minimum of legal control.”¹

According to this writer, Socialism is not to involve the abolition of private property and industry.

“There are many petty, subordinate industries, especially the making of articles of luxury, which might be allowed to remain in private hands.”

Workers at the dirty and disagreeable tasks are to receive compensation by greater leisure.

“If six hours be regarded as the normal working day, it is quite easy to believe that for the sake of the larger leisure, with its opportunities for the pursuit of special interests, many a man would gladly accept a disagreeable position for three hours a day.”

Equality of remuneration is not an essential condition of the Socialist régime. “It may be freely admitted, however, that the ideal to be aimed at ultimately, must be *approximate* equality of income.”

The individual is to be allowed to spend his wages, or hoard them, as he pleases. If he hoards, he may not bequeath any of his accumulated property to children or other relatives, for society is “the only possible inheritor of property.”

III

‘WHY IS THERE NO SOCIALISM IN THE UNITED STATES?’

The student of American Socialism will gain much help from Prof. Werner Sombart’s small volume, *Why is there no Socialism in the United States?*² The author, who has personally examined the conditions of working-class life in the great American cities, remarks that the United States form the natural Canaan or

¹ *Socialism*, pp. 218, 219.

² *Warum gibt es in den Vereinigten Staaten keinen Sozialismus?* (Tübingen. Mohr. 1906.

promised land of capital. There all the conditions are fulfilled which capital needs for its full and perfect development. It is favoured alike by the natural features of the country and by the character of the people. There is, to begin with, an abundant supply of precious metals and of the mineral products required for industry. "North America produces a third of all the silver, a quarter of all the gold which the earth possesses." The soil is marvellously fertile. The plain of the Mississippi comprises about five times as much corn-growing soil of the best type as the "black earth" districts of South Russia and Hungary.

Natural means of transport are found in the great rivers and in the splendid harbours. "On the Atlantic coast there are fifty-five good havens, which have been waiting for thousands of years for capital to make use of them."

The markets open to capital are as large, as compared with those of a European state, as one of the present older European states would have seemed in comparison with a mediæval town with its adjacent lands. It is the natural instinct of capital to seek indefinite expansion. Within the narrow limits of Europe its ambitions were checked and circumscribed, but on the vast plains of North America it can move with untrammelled freedom.

The first settlers in America were keen individualists. They had done with old Europe; they set sail for the New World. Their purpose was to build up for themselves a new life out of purely rational elements. "They had left behind them in their old homes all the ballast of the European system, all superfluous romance and sentimentality, all feudally-organized industrialism, everything that owed its origin to tradition." They had brought with them only those things which were helpful and serviceable for the development of capitalistic enterprise—a powerful, unshaken energy, and a view of life which caused them to regard occupation in the capitalistic spirit as a command of God, laid upon the believer as a duty."¹

The early American capitalists found that labour was scarce and therefore dear, so they were driven to the invention of labour-saving machinery. "There arose an impulse towards the highest

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 8.

technical perfection, which could never have developed with the same strength in one of the older civilized countries."

When at last the highest forms of economic and technical organizations were prepared, the great age of emigration began. Unnumbered multitudes of men and women offered themselves as the servants of capital. "We know," says Werner Sombart, "that during the last decades at least half-a-million human beings have arrived in the United States every year, and that in some years that number of immigrants has risen to three-quarters of a million."

Every American, from the newspaper boy upwards, is, as this writer has noticed, eager above all things to get on, to push himself beyond his present position; and this is one reason why the principle of *laissez-faire* is so generally accepted. It is felt to be the safest principle for the man who strives to succeed. "There is no country on earth in which the masses have been so drawn into the business of speculation as in the United States; no country in which the population has in such great numbers eaten of the fruit of capital."

It has often been said that the only Socialists in America are of German birth or descent.¹

Werner Sombart admits that in the literal sense such a statement is untrue. America has one, or rather two, Social Democratic Parties (as the name is understood on the Continent of Europe), and these are in no way supported by Germans only. At the Union Congress held at Indianapolis in 1901, only twenty-five delegates out of 124, *i.e.* about 20 per cent., were of foreign birth. "This party registered 403,338 votes at the last presidential election (1904), and to these we must add about 50,000 votes of the Socialist Labour Party. . . . Undoubtedly, also, the figures of the Socialist voting in America represent a minimum of the workmen who are socialistically inclined." . . . None the less, adds Werner Sombart, it cannot be disputed that the asser-

¹ Prof. Flint reminds us that of the eight "Chicago martyrs," five were born in Germany, and a sixth, although born in the States, was of German parentage and origin. Only one was of genuine American origin.—*Socialism*, pp. 35, 36, Note.

Dr. John Rae, in the new edition (1901) of his excellent work, says that "the Socialism of the American Socialist and revolutionary parties is a mere German import with as yet a purely German consumption."—*Contemporary Socialism*, p. 77.

tion, "The American people are not Socialists," is in the main based upon fact. The Socialist votes given at the presidential election represent, up to 1904, only about $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the total pollings. In 1900 the Socialists had only 98,417 votes. Even these cannot be counted on with certainty from year to year.

The following table¹ shows how the figures have wavered in some of the States.

VOTES GIVEN FOR SOCIALIST CANDIDATES

	1900.	1902.	1904.
Alabama . . .	928	2,313	853
Colorado . . .	684	7,431	4,304
Massachusetts . .	9,716	33,629	13,604
Pennsylvania . .	4,831	21,910	21,863
Texas . . .	1,846	3,513	2,791

Prof. Sombart reminds us that American working-men have no sympathy with the older Manchester School.

The American Federation of Labour demands the following reforms—

- (1) A legal eight-hours day ;
- (2) The municipalization of tramways, water-works, gas and electricity ;
- (3) The taking over by the State of telegraphs, telephones, railways and mines.
- (4) The abolition of private property in land and soil, and its replacement by tenancy and the mere right of use.

Thus the anti-Socialist American workman demands a large and generous programme of social reforms. On the whole, however, he is not discontented with things as they are. He surveys the world with rosiest optimism. His maxim is, "Live and let live." "The ground is thus cut away from all those moods and feelings upon which a European working-man builds up his class-consciousness—envy, bitterness and hatred against those who possess more, who live in luxury." The American worker has a boundless faith in the mission and in the greatness of his country.

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 26.

This faith often takes on a religious colouring. The American people are the chosen of God, the salt of the earth. Prof. Sombart quotes the words of Mr. Bryce—

“Pessimism is the luxury of a handful ; optimism is the private delight as well as public profession of 999 out of every 1,000 ; for nowhere does the individual associate himself more constantly and directly with the greatness of his country.” “This means,” says Prof. Sombart, “that the American workman identifies himself with the present American State ; he stands by the star-spangled banner ; he is patriotically inclined.”

The forces which encourage discontent are infinitely weaker than those which lead him to cherish pride and hope. He has really no quarrel with capital. He hopes and strives to become a capitalist. Every day some fortunate chance may open up to him. He has observed such amazing revolutions of fortune, such lightning transitions from poverty to wealth, that in imagination he sees the starry track glimmering beyond the low levels of his present attainments, and feels that he too may one day climb. Capital and labour, he thinks, ought to be partners, and to divide the results of industry in good faith and good feeling. For labourers to destroy capital would be a work of ignorance and evil passion. In the coming years, he believes there will be a restoration of the complete harmony between capital and labour, which has suffered only a transitory disturbance.

After quoting opinions such as these from American labour leaders, Prof. Sombart goes on : “But I think the relations of the American workmen to capital are even closer than we might gather from these announcements of friendship and proofs of esteem. I believe his heart is engaged on the side of capital. I believe he loves it. At all events, he surrenders himself to it body and soul.” He is passionately set on gain. We hear from the American workman few complaints about insufficient protection against trade accidents. He would rather run the risk of these than accept a protection which would lessen his wages. He works with a far keener intensity than his European comrade, simply because he is more eager to make money.¹

¹ “Es ist aber diese grössere Intensität seiner Arbeit gar nichts anderes als der Ausfluss seiner im Grunde echt kapitalistischen Sinnesart.”—*Op. cit.* p. 31.

Even if a future Socialist government were to create a vast number of safe salaried posts, if every workman could become a State official, the prospect would have no charm for the eager, ambitious, self-reliant sons of America, because it would shut out all prospect of advancement.

More than four-fifths of the organized workers belong to the "American Federation of Labour," which has immensely increased its numbers during the last twelve years. In 1896 the membership stood at 272,315; in 1904 it was 1,676,200. The guidance of this vast organization is in the hands of non-Socialists. The trades-unions form, to a considerable extent, close corporations of industry. "Numerous unions demand entrance fees, rising as high as fifty dollars. . . . Most of them limit the number of apprentices. Trade-unionism is the business method of effecting the betterment of the wage-earner under the highly-organised conditions of the modern industrial world."

Contrasting the position in America with that in Germany, Prof. Sombart says—

"With us it is the minority, and certainly not the *élite*, of the working classes, which seeks a connection with bourgeois social reformers—as, for instance, in the 'Association for Social Reform'; while the great majority of the organized workers remain in sharp class-opposition towards all bourgeois 'friends.' In America we find the exact contrary. The chief industrial leaders (who have behind them without doubt the *élite* of the organized workmen) mingle in the National Civic Federation—which corresponds fairly to our G.S.R.¹—with social reforming 'non-party men' and contractors. Only a small fraction stands sullenly aside, as the majority do with us."

"*De te fabula narratur, Europa*," says Werner Sombart, as he repeats his formula: "There is no Socialism in America. The United States are the country of the highest capitalistic development, their economic organization represents our future. . . . This land of our future has a working population which in the main is non-Socialist; does this phenomenon lie hidden for us also in the coming years? Were we wrong when we regarded the uprising of Socialism as a necessary consequence of capitalism? In order to answer these questions we

¹ *Gesellschaft für soziale Reform.*

must examine the causes which have led to the American workman's peculiar mode of thought."

This writer repudiates entirely the suggestion that the Anglo-Saxon races are naturally indisposed towards Socialism. "This reasoning is doubly mistaken. In the first place, the 'Anglo-Saxon' race is by no means naturally unreceptive towards Socialist ideas. In proof of this take the Chartist Movement in England of the 'thirties and 'forties, which was strongly tinged with Socialism; the development of the Australian colonies and even of the Mother Land during recent years. In the second place, the North American proletariat does not consist exclusively or even chiefly of members of the 'Anglo-Saxon' race. . . . Of the immigrant population in the United States, according to the census of 1900, only 8.1 per cent. came from England, 2.3 from Scotland; on the other hand, 25.8 per cent. came from Germany, 15.6 from Ireland, 7.8 from Russia and Poland. . . . Even if the total number of immigrants during the nineteenth century is considered, the proportion of those belonging to the Anglo-Saxon race is smaller than we are inclined to suppose; even including the Irish (who certainly compose more than half the total) the figures stand at only 33.58 per cent., as compared with 24.16 per cent. of German immigrants."

Millions of human beings from lands in which Socialism flourishes have migrated to America during the last generation. Even supposing that Anglo-Saxons were immune against the bacillus of Socialism, why have not these new settlers become Socialists in America?

Werner Sombart argues that the whole tendency of political and economic life in America is to alienate the working-men from Socialism. Both the great political parties court the workman's vote, and promise large reforms. By joining one or other of them, and thus alone, can he hope to achieve any practical results as a voter. Both the great parties are essentially popular parties. Each in the past has done good work for the "oppressed" classes. "The Republicans can point, as one leaf in their chaplet of fame, to the fact that they intervened on behalf of the slaves. The Democrats took up the cause of the exploited farmers," etc.

Each party to-day, by the whole nature of its organization, is deeply rooted in the sympathies of the people.

Wages in the United States, according to Werner Sombart's calculations, are twice or three times as high as in Germany. The American working-man lives in much greater comfort than his German brother, and spends more on food and clothing, though considerably less on drink. He is not housed in a huge barrack-like tenement, but in a comfortable home. Even great cities like Chicago and Philadelphia house their population in one- or two-storeyed cottages, inhabited usually by two families, only in rare exceptions by three or four. The cost, taking everything into consideration, is not greater than in Germany, and for the most part it is less in proportion to the comfort obtained. "We may take it as certain that the dwelling of the American workman will have on the average four rooms, while that of the German has not an average of two. . . . The inner furnishing of the home is incomparably more comfortable in America than with us. The better types of workmen's dwellings give the same impression as the homes of German families of the middle class; they are amply supplied with good beds, comfortable chairs, carpets, etc."

The average amount spent by the town-worker in America on the original furnishing of his home is from £21 to £32, or thereabouts. The German workman spends from £15 to £20. "But there is a striking difference in the sums allotted in the household budgets for renewal, repair of furniture, etc. In German households these amounts are for the most part ridiculously small in comparison with the corresponding sums in the American budgets. It seems as if the American working-man (like the middle-class householder with us) completes his furnishing gradually, while the German must content himself with his original purchases, and with the most absolutely necessary repairs."

To sum up, the American working-man, in this writer's opinion, is too well off to feel any hankering after Socialism. Even when the conditions of his life become oppressive, he can always "escape into freedom." He can build up for himself a new home in the West.

"I believe," says Werner Sombart, "that the explanation of the peculiarly peaceable disposition of the American workman lies above all in the fact that a practically indefinite number of able-bodied human beings were able, without any or almost any capital, to make themselves independent peasants by settling on the free soil."

The number of free farms is given according to the census as follows—

1850	1,449,073
1860	2,044,077
1870	2,659,985
1880	4,008,907
1890	4,564,641
1900	5,737,372 ¹

"These are all new peasant establishments, which have sprung up on virgin soil; for in the same years the extent of the land brought under cultivation increased almost in proportion to the number of the farms."

In European countries the trend of emigration has been away from the land; in America it is towards the land. During recent years the population of the Eastern States has shown a tendency to leave the rural districts and to settle in great cities, but elsewhere the movement towards new lands continues. Within a single generation nearly two and a half million persons from eight States alone² sought new homes, for the most part in agricultural regions.

In closing his short study, Werner Sombart expresses the opinion that the conditions which have hitherto retarded Socialistic progress in the States are changing so steadily that within the next generation we may expect to see Socialism unfolding itself in full flower upon American soil.

We may quote, in confirmation of Werner Sombart's main argument, the words of Dr. John Rae³—

"In America equality came as it were by nature, without strife and without so much as observation; the colonists started equal.

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 117.

² Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois—*Op. cit.* p. 138.

³ *Contemporary Socialism* (1901), p. 20.

. . . In the United States property is widely diffused ; liberty has been long enjoyed by the people as a fact, as well as loved by them as an ideal ; the central authority has ever been held in comparative check ; and individual rights are so general a possession that any encroachment upon them in the name of the majority would always tread on interests numerous and strong enough to raise an effectual resistance. Democracy has in America, accordingly, a soil most favourable to its healthy growth ; the history, the training and the circumstances of the people all concur to support liberty."

Professor Ely says—

"From Socialism as such, the American people, in the writer's opinion, have nothing to fear. So long as Socialists confine themselves to peaceful methods there is no reason why their right of free speech should be abridged or even feared. It were wiser to seek to learn anything from them which they have to teach than to become alarmed. It is the glory of America that she has faith to believe that only such institutions as rest upon sound common-sense and approved experience will be supported by the people." ¹

"Let us recognize," says a recent writer in the *International Socialist Review*, "that while our courageous comrades in Germany have an unrelenting enemy to fight *on the outside*, our enemy is *on the inside*—in the fierce individualism of American character. Individualism has been the sieve through which European immigration has sifted into America ; none but individualists have passed through. Our most difficult task is to handle our own forces." ²

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 287.

² E. Kelly, April 1908, p. 601.

NOTES ON AUSTRALIAN SOCIALISM

I

SOCIALISM WITHOUT DOCTRINES

M. MÉTIN gave to his study of Australian social conditions the title *Socialism without Doctrines*.¹ His phrase has been accepted by Dr. Victor S. Clark and the Hon. William Pember Reeves. A recent German writer expresses astonishment at "the unheard-of boldness and swiftness" with which Australia has advanced to the practical solution of questions which for us are still in the speculative stage.²

It was not, perhaps, without purpose that Browning addressed his poem, *The Guardian Angel*, to a friend "at the world's far end." The healing which the angel at Fano brought to him would be understood by one who had travelled to the new lands of hope. To mid-Victorian settlers Australia must have seemed like a new planet rather than a new continent. The evils of the old civilization were removed to an infinite distance.

The revivals which in the past had come through inspired individuals were now made possible through the opening up of untrodden lands, in which men of the European races could flourish. Browning's words must have expressed the inmost thought of many a colonist as his ship drew near a port of promise in Australia or New Zealand.

"How soon all worldly wrong would be repaired!

I think how I should view the earth and skies
And sea, when once again my brow was bared
After thy healing, with such different eyes."

¹ *Le Socialisme sans Doctrines*, by Albert Métin. (Félix Alcan. Paris. 1901.)

² *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft*, vol. xxiv. p. 30.

The hateful results of the old convict system had soon passed away. "A thriving population in a new country," says Dr. Clark, "cleanses itself like flowing water from the impurities of its source. If criminal tendencies predominated among many of the early settlers, these have been eliminated until the people are now more law-abiding than Americans."¹ Australasia, as Dr. Clark reminds us, is peopled by an almost purely British stock. "Three-fourths of the inhabitants were born in the colonies, and four-fifths of the remainder are natives of the British Islands. . . . The consciousness of national kinship, the collective family spirit, is greater than in America, and for this reason communal sympathies are more active and the Socialist tendency more pronounced."

It was not only to the skilled and educated workman that the colonies offered the chance of comfort and prosperity. The unskilled labourer enjoyed a much more favourable position than in Europe or America, for the land was undeveloped, and the first task was to discover and turn to profit its primary resources. The shearer was more necessary than the factory worker, and the sheep farms offered opportunities for employment which demanded no great technical skill. The supply of labour was small in proportion to the demand, so that the general average of wages remained high. Sir Charles Dilke, in *Problems of Greater Britain*, showed how the Australian workman has fought "for a life of comfort and well-earned partial leisure against a life of mere existence."² The workers began to organize themselves in the years following 1850, in connection with the movement for an eight-hours day. Trades-unions were established in all the colonies on the English model. Years of prosperity were enjoyed between 1880 and 1890. It is estimated that in 1885 150,000 workmen were organized. The "Australian Federation of Labour" was founded in 1889 under the influence of William Lane. It seemed possible at that time that Labour, strongly organized and well provided with funds, might be able to dictate terms on all industrial matters. Its leaders were already looking towards a practical, if not a theoretical Socialism. But the masters had also

¹ *The Labour Movement in Australasia*, pp. 19, 20.

² Vol. ii. part vi. ch. ii.

been organizing in defence of their own interests, and the result was seen in the failure of the great strikes of 1890 and 1891.

Mr. W. P. Reeves considers that the year 1890 marks a new departure in colonial politics.

"Before 1890 the State was already the great landlord, the chief employer of labour, was virtually sole owner of the land transport, as well as of the telegraphs and telephones. It undertook the business of land registration and transfer, and in one colony, New Zealand, had established a large Life Insurance Office, and a Public Trust Office, the work of which is pre-eminently beneficial. In addition to the duties of land settlement, nearly all the colonies had supplied the labour market by importing many thousands of immigrants. Protection of native industries was a general policy, and bonuses were offered, notably the Victorian bonus on exported butter. In addition to railway making, the governments were spending millions on roads, bridges, harbour-works and water-supply. They had always taken the completest powers of inspection over flocks and herds, and in the eighties were beginning to inspect factories in the interests of women and children workers. Last, but not least, by a series of Acts chiefly passed between 1873 and 1880 they had broken with clerical schools and had developed their own systems of primary education."¹

The question, as Mr. Reeves says, might naturally have been asked at that time, can the force of State interference go further?

"It was the State ownership of land," he remarks, "and above all, of the means of transport, which really set the colonists' feet on the road they are now treading. For the departures I have spoken of were all taken by the middle classes before Socialism and Labour parties were heard of. So that when, after 1890, middle-class spokesmen, confronted with the new forces, would fain have harked back to the principles of individualism, they found the past policy of their class rise up in judgment against them."²

The shearers' strike and the maritime strike were among the fiercest conflicts ever waged between capital and labour. It is said that the men lost £400,000 in wages, and the loss of business in Australia was estimated at between four and five millions. Mr. St. Ledger says—

¹ *State Experiments in Australia and New Zealand*, vol. i. p. 50.

² *Ibid.* p. 63.

"Though probably the money loss was by no means as great as had been suffered previously from similar strikes in England and America, yet, compared with the total wealth of the country and the gigantic sweep and rapidity of the industrial civil war, it may be doubted if the strikes were not the most startling exhibition in all history of the terrible and pent-up forces of combined labour *versus* combined capitalism."¹

The German critic from whom we have already quoted says—

"When work was at length resumed in 1893, the workers had been beaten along the whole line. . . . The trades-unions could not prevent a heavy fall in wages. They lost about half their members, and they held no more Congresses."

It is generally agreed that out of these strikes has grown the extensive legislation which deals with Wages Boards, Compulsory Conciliation and Arbitration Boards. At the beginning of the strikes the union men asked that employers and employed should meet in conference to arbitrate on the points at issue. This was refused both by the proletariat and the shipowners. Mr. St. Ledger says: "After strikes were declared 'off,' public opinion raised again the minor issue—the right of the worker to at least a conference of arbitrators on all matters affecting trades disputes between amalgamated bodies of workers."

The financial crisis of 1893 worked to the advantage of the Labour-Socialist Party, which won eighty seats in the State Lower Houses at the elections of that year.

"The public," says Mr. St. Ledger, "were far greedier for the revenge than for the evangel of Socialism. Hence Socialism scored its heavy representation in the Australian Parliaments immediately after 1890, reaching its highest points in 1893-94. Socialism received its first great impetus owing to the financial failure of State experiments in enterprises elsewhere left to private individual resources."²

Mr. W. P. Reeves remarks that students of State experiments in the Colonies, may, if they please, distinguish between Socialism and a sort of Socialism.

"The German phalanx which ranked itself behind Liebknecht and Bebel would probably decline to acknowledge any colonial

¹ *Australian Socialism*, p. 51.

² *Ibid.* p. 75.

party—with the possible exception of the Queensland Labour men—as a Socialist regiment. But though there is no Social Democratic Party, there is a good deal of democratic Socialism. It is none the less real because it is ‘a sort of’ Socialism, finds expression in acts, and eschews short-cuts to a new earth which will ‘make the old heaven unnecessary.’”¹

Two points must be kept in mind as we consider Australian Socialism—

(1) The rank and file are not idealists. They are seeking practical and immediate advantages for themselves, and if Socialism fails to promise them these benefits, the entire Labour Movement may be diverted into a new channel.

(2) The Labour Party has adopted as one of its chief planks the principle of a white Australia. The working classes have no intention of admitting the tropical races into their ideal Commonwealth. As Dr. Clark says: “The passive hosts of the Orient are natural enemies of Socialism. They represent an impending economic peril to white workers.”

II

THE CAREER OF WILLIAM LANE

The most recent writer on Australian Socialism is Mr. A. St. Ledger, Senator for the State of Queensland in the Commonwealth Parliament.² Mr. St. Ledger claims that Socialism received its original impulse in Australia through the powerful personality and brilliant propaganda of William Lane, the famous Queensland editor.

“Australian Socialism had its origin not in any protest against any social tyranny, any economic oppression; not from the dominance of any ecclesiastical or monarchical régime; but in the deliberate adoption of an ideal, to be realized by a community then enjoying every opportunity which liberty, justice, intelligence, and prosperity could procure for it. It was a leap backwards to the ideals of Plato’s *Republic* or More’s *Utopia*. It was adopted

¹ *State Experiments in Australia and New Zealand*, vol. i. p. 68.

² *Australian Socialism: An Historical Sketch of its Origin and Developments*, by A. St. Ledger, Senator for the State of Queensland in the Commonwealth Parliament. (Macmillan. 1909.)

by the Australian people after they had eradicated all vestige of privilege and, politically, had established almost absolute class equality."

Australia, in the opinion of this writer, had already become the paradise of the working-man, and had apparently uttered democracy's last word, before Socialism gained any ascendancy among the people. "It sprang full armed from the brain of one man—William Lane, a Canadian by birth, English by extraction, and by profession a journalist."

William Lane was for several years (1883-85) engaged as a reporter on a Brisbane paper called the *Observer*, to which he contributed a weekly column of sketches dealing with the conditions of the working classes of that city. He wrote with glowing passion, and gathered round him a band of eager young men, with whose aid he founded a weekly illustrated newspaper, the *Boomerang*. He made this journal a financial success, and preached through it the gospel of Socialism.

"He wrote, he preached, and he stormed at the trades-unions. He did more. He organized them in preparation for action, infecting, if not the rank and file, those whose services were the more effective, the leading officials of the various branches and trades, and the trustees of the Central Boards of Control directing the affiliated trades-unions. . . . He showered pamphlets in thousands amongst them. He had agents in every centre of population. His weekly paper circulated in every mining-camp and shearing-shed in Queensland, giving expression to his views and objects. He founded debating societies and reading clubs amongst the workers; furnished them with leaflets and pamphlets containing the pith, and often the whole text, of such writers as Marx, Bellamy and Bax. His genial magnetic personality drew hundreds of young workers, artisans, clerks, and many of the restless, discontented enthusiasts in every walk of life around him. He succeeded, to the very letter of his purpose, in establishing the best-organized band of workers in Australia, and probably in the world."¹

William Lane was the founder of that influential Brisbane Socialist paper, the *Worker*. It was published at first monthly, but after a time was issued as a weekly. Mr. St. Ledger, who is

¹ *Australian Socialism*, pp. 10, 11.

hostile to Socialism, pays a high tribute to Mr. Lane's honesty and his zeal for the people's cause. His principles on their economic side were practically identical with those of European Socialists. Like the modern French Syndicalist, he worked mainly through the trades-unions. When he began his campaign, they were cautious and practically-minded organizations which used their power mainly to secure concessions from employers. William Lane sought to win these bodies for pure Socialism. With characteristic honesty, he told his followers that the immense revolution of Socialism could not be immediately accomplished. The trades-unionists naturally pressed for a quick realization of the dream. Lane in reply asked them to return a Socialist Parliament, and he proclaimed as the ultimatum of Labour, "Socialism in our time." He succeeded in founding the Australian Labour Federation, into which he drew both skilled and unskilled men.

"In this way," says Mr. St. Ledger, "the trades-unionists of Australia were captured by Socialists. They were to be the masters; the Socialists the servants. As soon as Labour—*quâ* Labour—went to the ballot-box, the Socialists became and have since remained the masters; the trades-unionists became and have since remained the servants. Lane clearly foresaw this result."¹

It was between the years 1885 and 1890 that Lane organized his army.

"He was then in the position of a Bismarck. He had but to provoke capitalism to a declaration of war; and to be careful only of the time, opportunity, and reason of the declaration. There was a cauldron brewing; the witches were busy at work. Lane, like Macbeth, consulted with them long and earnestly, and, like Macbeth, the inspiration ended in his complete ruin, personally and politically, and landed Australia in an era of class strife which has continued to the present hour."²

Lane failed utterly to capture Parliament through the trades-unions.

Deeply disappointed with the treatment he received from his comrades, he determined to found a new Australia in Paraguay. The government of that country was willing to give him and his

¹ *Australian Socialism*, pp. 18, 19.

² *Ibid.*

followers the needed concessions, and Lane embarked the whole of his own capital in the enterprise. He required from his followers a grant of not less than fifty pounds each to the common fund. In the constitution which he drew up for the new association, one of the principles was as follows: "The maintenance by the community of children under the guardianship of the parents, subject to the supremacy of the law of the State settled in, which all members pledged themselves to observe loyally."

Notwithstanding the tremendous difficulties of the scheme, Lane believed that he could create in the wilds of Paraguay a great Socialistic State, but he was unfitted in many ways for the leadership of such an enterprise, and the scheme ended in disaster.

After the loss and ruin of his Paraguay experiment, Lane left for London. He ultimately emigrated to New Zealand, where he took up his former profession of journalism.

III

VIEWS OF A GERMAN WORKMAN AT MELBOURNE

Die Neue Zeit published a few months ago an article entitled, "The Labour Movement in Australia," by a German worker in Melbourne.¹ The author of this paper is a man of pronounced Socialist views.

He says: "The eight-hours' day has become a generally recognized institution. At the yearly procession of the eight-hour workers in Melbourne over seventy trades-unions with banners and flags are represented. They march past Government House before the Governor and the other big-wigs, and at an evening gathering these people belaud them in flattering speeches. In spite of this, the eight-hour day is not legally established. At the end of the 'sixties we also secured early shop closing. Most stores are now shut at six in the evening, and on Saturday at one. The saloons, the tobacconists' shops and others of that kind are excepted, as well as some little shops in the suburbs which have special permission to keep open longer. The public-houses are obliged to close at eleven-thirty p.m. and on Sundays are closed all day. In the tobacco stores and similar shops the employees are not allowed to work more than fifty-four hours a week. The

¹ January 27, 1909.

provisions adopted under the Victorian Factories Act also regulate wages. The Wages Board, which is composed in equal numbers of employers and workmen with an impartial chairman, fixes the wages which shall be paid in every industry. The wages are very different in the different industries. Women and children (many of the latter leave school at the age of twelve to become factory workers) always come off very badly in these wage-decisions, although our social legislation is so highly praised."

This German writer goes on—

"The working classes—we might rather say the whole population—are from the political standpoint still very backward. The chief cause of this is their religiosity, that is to say, their habit of church-going. A shopkeeper who does not belong to any religious sect can hardly do any business. Many people who consider themselves politically free, are in such dread of hell and the devil that at election times they throw themselves into the arms of the Conservatives. Among the immigrants that came to this country in the fifties there were many who had felt the breath of that wind of revolution which blew over Europe in 1848 and 1849. They remembered Thomas Paine, Robert Owen and the Chartists. These people founded societies in which religious and political questions were discussed on Sundays. Spiritualists were also among the newcomers, and their philosophic lectures and debates, in which strong emphasis was often laid on Communism, shook the confidence of many a man in the religious faith he had learned from early days. This movement, however, soon fell into the hands of charlatans, who still in the capacity of mediums do a good business among the credulous. The Radical associations (the free discussion societies) were soon cried down as atheistical, and gradually lost their attractive power. The atheistic movement is to-day led by Mr. Fleming, who delivers public lectures on Sundays in the Yarra Park at Melbourne. Since he comes forward as an avowed Anarchist, he gives the opponents of Socialism an excuse for describing every effort after social reform as anarchical. One favourite lie is constantly on the lips of our opponents: 'Socialists wish to abolish the family.'"

On this question of Socialism and the family, we may quote the words of an opponent of Socialism, Mr. St. Ledger. He says in his preface—

"A great deal of indignation has been expressed by members of

the Labour Party at the charge that Australian Socialism seeks to weaken the marriage tie and invade the sanctity of the family. It is but fair to say that this charge is as foolish as it is unwarrantable. As a party and in their Press organs, they have strongly supported a high standard of moral life. Their official Press is one of the cleanest of the world, and the general morale of the party is of the highest. They number probably quite more than the average proportion of men of singularly honest, upright, industrious lives. On the other hand, they cannot deny that many European Socialistic writers contend that Christianity and the duties and the rights which it confers on family life are the basic social bulwarks barring the way against the realization of their economic ideals. Australian Socialists, however, unanimously condemn this part of the European Socialistic Gospel."¹

The writer in the *Neue Zeit* goes on—

"Church leaders and preachers have not been idle during the last thirty or forty years. With the aid of the temperance men they have carried complete Sunday rest. A German or other newcomer from Europe flings up his hands in amazement: 'What? We can't get a glass of beer here on Sundays, not even in one's clubs or union? Is this English freedom? Thank you for nothing.' But this is how matters stand.

"The Church has its chief influence in the Young Men's Christian Association and in the union for young persons born in the colony. Besides these, the Salvation Army is very strong, and so are the sects, numbering a hundred or more, in which each individual seeks salvation according to the mode that best suits him. All this hinders rational thinking on religious and social questions.

"The great daily newspapers in Melbourne, Sydney, Adelaide and other large towns publish column-long articles on every church quarrel, and conduct also an active propaganda on behalf of English Imperialism, according to which a standing army and fleet are necessary in view of the possibility that Germany and Japan might invade our shores. The telegrams from Europe are dressed up so as to suit this policy. When an international or national Socialist Congress is being held, this remark is regularly introduced: 'There is great disputing between the different sections.' No other account is given except perhaps a few distorted utterances. The same thing happens as regards lectures and occurrences which concern the Labour Party here."

¹ *Australian Socialism*, p. ix.

This German workman thinks that while the Australian educational system is based on sound principles, the children are allowed too many holidays, and he disapproves of their occupation with military drill.

"The working classes as a whole," he says, "consider that wage-slavery is inevitable, they only beg the masters for a little more time, a little higher wage, a little better treatment. Besides this, they demand nothing, and fritter away their leisure time with football and cricket. On September 26 of last year [*i.e.* 1907] more than 49,000 spectators assembled on the Melbourne football ground."

This Melbourne workman thinks that Socialism in Australia is coming more and more to the front. "German Social Democrats were the leaven of the movement in the principal towns. The social-democratic union, *Vorwärts*, in Melbourne has existed for over twenty years, possesses a good library and takes in such German journals as the *Hamburger Echo*, *Vorwärts*, *Die Neue Zeit*, *Der Wahre Jacob*, etc. . . . But most of the Germans are indifferent to Socialism."

"When Tom Mann, who was known in England along with Ben Tillett, Keir Hardie and others as a good agitator, came out to Australia five years ago, he was engaged by the Labour Council to carry on propaganda for the workers' party. He is an excellent orator, who knows how to grip an audience, and he bases himself on the principles of the social-democratic programme of Erfurt. He frequently praises the German Social Democrats as a model party. In his pamphlets *Socialism*, *The Labour Problem in both Hemispheres*, and a number of other works the Erfurt programme is printed. . . . Tom Mann defends the full policy of international Socialism. He thus went too far for the men who had engaged him. They wanted him to work solely for the programme of the Labour Party. He therefore gave up his contract before the term expired. Tom Mann founded in Melbourne the association called 'The Socialist Party,' which has now more than 2,000 paying members and publishes a weekly paper called *The Socialist*. In its hall in Elizabeth Street lectures and courses of instruction are given for the training of men and women speakers. A Sunday-school has been established for children. On Saturday evenings the agitation is carried on in the suburbs in open spaces, while women and girls sell pamphlets and newspapers.

On Sunday afternoons meetings are held in the open air and in the evening in the Bijou Theatre, where Tom Mann or some other party speaker gives the address. . . . Tom Mann also travels on behalf of the cause. He lately visited New Zealand, and is now working among the silver-miners at Broken Hill. There he succeeded in persuading the different trades-unions to place themselves under a central leadership, that in this way they might present a united front in opposition to the so-called free, non-political union, which is on good terms with the mine-owners."

Among the Labour newspapers which have a markedly Socialist complexion, the Melbourne writer mentions especially *The Labour Call*, of Melbourne; *The Worker*, of Brisbane; *The Flame*, of Broken Hill; *The Clipper*, in Hobart Town; and *The Worker*, of Perth.

Looking at the situation as a whole, this writer thinks that real advance is being made. "If Social Democracy becomes stronger in England, progress here will probably be hastened. The average man is still rather frightened at anything which is 'made in Germany.'"

IV

DIVISIONS OF AUSTRALIAN SOCIALISTS

Australian Socialists are divided amongst themselves on the question of remedial legislation. We take some passages on this subject from recent numbers of two well-known journals.

The Worker,¹ of Brisbane.

In a recent article on "Wages Boards and Revolutions," *The Worker* contained the following passage—

"*The Worker* is not among that peculiar and fortunately exclusive species of Socialists who scorn palliatives and hate with a vitriolic hatred those who see any virtue in them. It perplexes us to know why sane men should grow so furious when by legislation the lot of the suffering is made a little more bearable. If it is not in our power to completely cure them, must we not therefore do what we can to alleviate their pain? To hold that

¹ *The Worker*, Brisbane, February 6, 1909. This ably-conducted paper is the official journal of the Federated Workers of Queensland.

we should leave them to suffer and go on spouting about the efficacy of a remedy that cannot be applied, strikes us as a symptom of mental disease. . . . The improvement of bad conditions when and how we can, even though the root of the evil be left untouched, is perfectly legitimate. It conforms to every instinct of reason and humanity. What we have to guard against is the mistaking of palliatives for cures. What we have to do is concentrate on curative measures. The patient can only be brought to full health and strength by a long course of treatment ; though in the meantime he may be made as comfortable as possible. Socialism cannot be brought to pass by one revolutionary pill or surgical operation. The complicated complaint from which Society suffers can only be cured by the administration of homeopathic doses."

How entirely opposed to the teaching of Georges Sorel is this passage from the same article—

"Capitalism is not a malignant growth or excrescence that can be cut away with the knife, or dealt with by drastic drenches ; it is a malady pervading the entire system, subtly insinuated into every drop of its blood and every atom of its frame, and in the nature of the case the cure must be gradual, and carefully adapted to the constitution of the sufferer. It does not sound heroic, but we are not anxious about heroics. We are anxious only to help on the good work in the best possible way, and there is often more true heroism in restraint than in the most violent outbreaks. . . . Inculcate Socialism. Yes, but grab all you can to be going on with. Preach the revolutionary thought. Yes, but rely on the ameliorative method. . . . The minds of men are of slow development, and we must be content, we fear, to accomplish our revolution piecemeal, bit by bit, till a point is come to when, by a cumulative process, a series of small changes amounts to the Great Change. The most important revolutions are those that happen quietly without anything particularly noticeable seeming to occur."

The Worker has abandoned the Marxian catastrophic theory for a policy of drastic social reform. Its teaching does not differ widely from that of Bernstein, although it is careful to warn Socialists that palliative measures must not be confounded with curative legislation. "Such measures as workers' compensation, old age pensions, and mines and factory regulation have power to help, but not to heal." Among measures which will attack the

disease of capitalism *The Worker* mentions "the nationalization of industries, the stoppage of land alienation, the substitution wherever an opportunity presents itself of public enterprise for private exploitation and the State absorption of the unemployed." Socialism, according to *The Worker*, is to come by a process of evolution.

In another article *The Worker* acknowledges the deep divisions among Socialists, but refuses to take

"a doleful outlook on this interminable scene of war. . . . When we engage in fratricidal combat it is only the storm that precipitates the shower. It is only the thrusting of green spears through the sides of the earth. It is only the growl of thunder that heralds the defeat of the drought. It is only the electrical display that clears the air. It isn't that we really hate one another, any more than the opposing chemical constituents of the tempest hate one another. We are simply fulfilling the universal law of strife, the condition of progress. . . . In the beginning there will be plenty of internecine trouble under Socialism. We shall all want to be happy different ways, and there is bound to be a row about it." ¹

A discussion has been going on during recent months in *The Worker* on Revolutionary Socialism. The editor claims that his party and not the extremists are the true followers of Marx and Engels. We may quote these parallel passages—

**PROGRAMME OF MARX IN
COMMUNIST MANIFESTO.**

Abolition of property in land, and application of all rents of land to public purposes.

Heavy progressive or graduated Income Tax.

Centralization of credit in the hands of the State, by means of a National Bank, with State capital and an exclusive monopoly.

Centralization of the means communication and transport in the hands of the State.

Extension of factories and

**PLATFORMS OF FEDERAL AND
STATE LABOUR PARTY.**

Immediate stoppage of all further sales of Crown lands. Tax on publicly-created land values.

Progressive Income Tax.

Commonwealth Bank of Issue, Deposit, Exchange and Reserve.

(Post, telephones, telegraphs and railways are already in the hands of the State.)

Collective ownership of the

instruments of production owned by the State.

Free education for all children in public schools.

Abolition of children's factory labour in its present form.

means of production, distribution and exchange by the extension of the industrial and economic functions of the State.

(Free education already secured.)

(Abolition of children's factory labour in form referred to already accomplished.)

"That parallel between the Marxian programme and the Labour platforms proves their practical identity. It proves that Marx and Engels were animated by the same principles, and aimed at their consummation by the same methods, as the Labour Party of Australia.

"The similarity is indeed so remarkable that every criticism levelled against the Labour Party's platform is one directed against the Marxian method."¹

"Our 'revolutionary friends,' " says *The Worker*, "are on the wrong track. They have studied their Marx too microscopically and have failed for that reason to perceive the sweeping comprehensiveness of his principles. They have done what Marx said the Socialists should not do—formed themselves into a separate party. . . . By standing aloof from the greatest organizations or the working-class in Australia they are turning themselves into sectaries, and violating the spirit of the Marxian teaching. . . . They are persons, in our view, who have formed such Utopian notions of the proletarian movement that they cannot recognize the real thing when they bump against it."

This attitude of *The Worker* has stirred some opposition among its readers. In the number for March 13, 1909, Mr. Andrew M. Anderson has a long letter entitled, *Revolutionary Socialism v. Labour Party*. His views appear to be practically those of the leaders of French and Italian Syndicalism. Thus he says—

"The Revolutionary Socialist believes that the wage-workers of the world must be organized, both on the political and economic fields, and that on both fields the aim should be the same, viz. the taking and holding of the means of life."

The word "taking" in this connection is important. "A working class in real deadly earnest," says this writer, "will wrest

¹ *The Worker*, February 27, 1909.

more reforms from the capitalist class than palliative legislation can ever accomplish."

In answering its "revolutionary" friends, *The Worker* calls attention to the fact that the French, Belgian, Austrian and German parties demand those very palliatives which the extreme section condemns as likely to defer the overthrow of Capitalism. It is interesting to note that this journal constantly falls back on the Communist Manifesto as the inspiring document of the Australian Labour Party. The position of the Labour Party

"may be summed up in a phrase—the accomplishment of revolutionary ends by evolutionary means.

"Even in details, such as the plank, 'Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the State,' and the demand for the establishment of a 'National Bank,' the Communist Manifesto is anticipatory of Labour party methods.

"And it was certainly not the intention, it certainly has not been the effect, of the Communist Manifesto to 'prevent Capitalism from ripening' to its ruin.

"The evil results of the economic process can be mitigated without in the least hindering the development of the process. That is what our 'revolutionary' critics have got to learn. The class war on which they take their stand, as we do also, must go on, but that is all the more reason why we should welcome the ambulance brigade, and the hospitals, and laws to govern the conduct of the belligerents, and other palliative measures assuaging the horrors of war."¹

"If ever the day comes," says *The Worker*, "when bullets are needed to back up ballots, we shall be there with our little gun. If, on the other hand, Capitalism will permit us to achieve the revolution bit by bit, a little to-day and some more to-morrow, and will allow us to quietly overthrow its system and dispossess it, we shall be glad to leave the gun at home and call ourselves piecemeal if not peaceful revolutionists."²

The Flame

Another popular Socialist paper is *The Flame*,³ of Broken Hill. *The Flame* describes itself as the "tongue of revolution." Its language is much more violent than that of *The Worker*.

¹ *The Worker*, February 20, 1909.

² *Ibid.*

³ *The Flame* (Broken Hill) represents the Socialist Federation of Australasia with its extremist principles.

"The Labour parliamentary," says *The Flame*, "stands for the reactionary tendencies within Labourism, and consequently for all that spine-bending, mind-drugging, political garbage—or method of action—which has at last roused to anger the militant, deadly-earnest workers within Labourism who seek drastic and basic social changes."¹

Here are some characteristic passages from *The Flame*—

"Whatever the working class do in the FIGHTING SPIRIT is right. It is only what they leave UNDONE that condemns them.

"Put not your faith in Labour misrepresentatives or in any child of Capitalism, but fight the good fight with your own strong arms and brains."²

After the Socialist Congress of last summer, *The Flame* wrote—

"The second conference of Socialist organizations has considerably clarified the party position. The break from Labourism is at length as definite as it is unassailable. The events of the past twelve months have shifted Socialism faster from the Reformist quagmire—they have speeded Socialism further from Labourism. As if to justify the Socialists' partial renunciation of a year ago, Labour representatives, alike in the political and industrial fields, have manifested accelerated reaction plus increased impotence. Of its own momentum Labourism now could do nought but roll to ruin. It exists but to demonstrate its uselessness. The generating of the Socialist Federation of Australasia is not alone justified—it is shown, by the resistless logic of experience, to have been necessary. To it belongs the future; and only on account of this is working-class emancipation achieved."

"The S.F.A.," we read again, "is out to abolish Capitalism. . . . No 'palliative legislation' can remove the beating, the shaming, and the thieving. Poverty and unemployment, hardship and hunger, sin and suffering—these are ever-present. They shall be with us though you place upon our statute-books every plank of every Labour platform. Surely nothing could make plainer the futility and imbecility of the palliative policy than the fact that the planks of Labourism as advertised in the six States of the Commonwealth would take a century to pass at the reasonably rapid rate of one per annum! And every successive Labour conference has newer and multiplied planks

¹ *The Flame*, September 5, 1908. In the same number *The Flame* has a symposium entitled, "Why the Labour Party will not do."

² *Ibid.* January 18, 1909.

advocated! Of course, the truth is that palliation breeds palliation; the vitaler truth is that the vampire of Capitalism cannot be cured but must be killed. Once again we repeat that the Present System cannot be mended—it must be ended.”¹

This is almost exactly the language of men like Labriola and Lagardelle.

V

THE NEWER LABOUR LEGISLATION

Werner Sombart says that he cannot quite understand why the example of the Australian Colonies should be quoted as a cardinal instance by those who wish to prove that the modern working-class movement has not everywhere a Socialistic tendency.² The truth is that the working classes of Australia, while carefully avoiding any identification of their own cause with that of the Socialists, have advanced a very long way on the path of social reform. Their Socialism is not an artificial scheme forced upon the government of the day. It has grown up out of the necessities of the situation. Our wisest political thinkers at home, whether they call themselves Liberals or Conservatives, have learned a great deal from the Australian Labour programme.³

The new *Australian Official Year-book* gives the trades-unions full credit for the industrial legislation of modern times.

“They steadily and continuously urged an amelioration of the condition of the working-man, and by organization and discipline they presented a united front to opposing forces, and attained many advantages by a recognition of the principle that unity is strength. Their efforts have resulted in improved conditions, particularly short hours and a healthier mode of life. One great aim of present-day industrial legislation has been said to be to extend ‘the reasonable comforts of a civilized community’ to those engaged in every branch of industry.”⁴

¹ *The Flame*, August 8, 1908.

² *Sozialismus und Soziale Bewegung*, p. 287.

³ We must note, however, that Prof. Werner Sombart does not attempt to use the special circumstances of Australia as a typical instance for all the world. He almost apologizes for “dragging in” Australia. We may quote his words in the original: “Ich habe nur auf Australien Rücksicht genommen, weil es mir als Gegenargument vorgehalten war. Besser: es gar nicht als Beweismittel zu verwenden. Besser: sich im alten Europa und allenfalls den Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika umzusehen.”—*Ibid.* p. 289.

⁴ *Australian Official Year-book* (1909), p. 1048.

The early unionists demanded reforms which have now been conceded almost in their entirety. Each State has its own effective legislation dealing with industrial life. Each State, except Tasmania, has regulated the hours of business for the great majority of shops and factories. The editor of the new *Year-book* remarks that at the present time there is an obvious tendency to adjust industrial matters in Australia on uniform lines.

"The industrial condition of any State of the Commonwealth naturally reacts quickly on any other State. This is one of the consequences of a unified tariff, and of the fact that the general economic conditions of any one part of the Commonwealth must necessarily affect very intimately any other part. An expression of the intimacy of these economic and industrial relations of different parts is seen, for example, in the refusal of an Arbitration Court in New South Wales to fix wages in the boot trade in that State at a higher rate than that fixed by the Wages Board in Victoria, because of the additional burden which such a rate would place on local manufactures."¹

The Labour Party has powerfully influenced Australian politics during the last twenty years.

"In 1904 a Labour Government occupied the Commonwealth Treasury benches, and again, in December 1908, a second Labour Government took office. The second Deakin Ministry had the support of the Labour Party. In South Australia the Premier is a direct Labour representative. In Queensland, a third of the House of Representatives are Labour members. In New South Wales the election of 1907 strengthened the party, and it is now an important element in Parliament. Victoria and Western Australia have also elected a considerable number of direct Labour Representatives."²

Each of the Colonies has a magnificent record of laws carried in the interests of the workers. New South Wales has its Factories Act of 1896; its three early closing laws; the Industrial Arbitration Acts of 1901, 1905, and 1908, and many minor regulations.

Victoria has three important factories and shop laws (1905, 1907, and 1909). The further list of Victorian measures includes

¹ *Australian Official Year-book* (1909), p. 1049.

² *Ibid.* p. 1052. For the full table of laws relating to conditions of labour which have been passed since 1886, we must refer readers to the *Year-book* of 1909.

the Mines Act of 1897, the Labour and Capital Laws of 1890 and 1901, and the Workers' Homes Act of 1904.

Queensland dealt with the factories and shops in 1900 and again in 1908. Its Wages Board Act dates from 1908.

In South Australia, West Australia, and Tasmania, we find a remarkable series of enactments on similar lines. The youngest Parliaments of the world have set a truly inspiring example.

Questions of wages and employment are regulated in Australia under two different systems. The first is that of Wages Boards, which exist in New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, and South Australia. In Western Australia there is an Arbitration Court. In New South Wales, the Acts of 1901 and 1905 instituted an Arbitration Court, but this court expired on June 30, 1908. Wages Boards were substituted under the Industrial Disputes Acts of last year. The Arbitration Court of the Commonwealth has power to deal only with matters extending beyond the limits of a single State.¹

The editor of the *Year-book* says: "It may be noted that the Boards of Conciliation, appointed in England under the Conciliation Act, 1897, appear to correspond to the Australian Wages Board in a remarkable degree, and not in any way to the Arbitration Courts of Australia, inasmuch as they are appointed for each trade or calling, and not to adjudicate generally upon any cases which come before them."²

The Compulsory Arbitration Laws of Australia at present in force are the following—

Commonwealth. The Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act of 1904.

South Australia. The Conciliation Act of 1894.

West Australia. The Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act of 1902.

The New South Wales Acts, as we have mentioned, expired on June 30, 1908.

The Commonwealth and Western Australian Acts forbid strikes and lock-outs.

There can be no question that the monetary position of Australian workers has been improved by the industrial legislation of the past twenty years. The most striking advance in wages

¹ See the *Year-book*, 1909, p. 1064.

² *Ibid.* p. 1066.

has been that obtained by women employed in the clothing trades. In 1897 the average weekly wage for these workers was 8s. 8d.; it is now 16s. 11d. for piece-workers, and 19s. 11d. for others. In Tasmania, where no anti-sweating law exists, females of three and five years' service, and of twenty to twenty-six years of age, receive in the clothing factories 12s. a week.¹

On June 10, 1908, an Act was passed by the Commonwealth Parliament to provide for the payment of invalid and old age pensions. In this Act, which came into force on July 1, 1909, the age qualification is fixed at sixty-five years, or in the event of permanent incapacitation from work, sixty years. In the case of an invalid pension, the applicant must be above the age of sixteen years and must be permanently incapacitated for work by reason of an accident or by reason of his being an invalid. The estimated cost of the Commonwealth Old Age Pensions on the basis of New Zealand experience is from £1,440,000 in 1909-10 to £2,320,000 in 1926-27.

Although the Labour Party have gained much, their demands are not yet fully satisfied. At the Sydney Conference of 1902, the "fighting platform" included the following "planks"—

- (1) Maintenance of a White Australia.
- (2) Compulsory Arbitration.
- (3) Old Age Pensions.
- (4) Nationalization of Monopolies.
- (5) Citizen Defence Force.
- (6) Restriction of Public Borrowing.
- (7) Navigation Laws.

Most of this programme, as Mr. St. Ledger says, might be accepted by any Liberal, and a great portion of it is in process of realization.

"The practical objects of the Labour Party," writes Dr. Clark, "are not so much Socialist as Social Democratic. They look towards collectivism, but recognize wages, profits and the conditions of capitalist production as matters to be accepted in present legislation. Here the party breaks with doctrinaire Socialists, of whom there are a few in Australia and New Zealand, whose active but not very formidable opposition it is obliged to meet. . . . There is little Social idealism among the rank and file of the

¹ See the *Year-book*, 1909, pp. 1072, 1073.

working classes. They are mostly seeking immediate and concrete results, and so far as any directive purpose on their part is concerned, it is merely an accident that the policy thus determined tends towards Socialism."¹

New Zealand has a most honourable record in the history of industrial legislation. In 1848, the Otago Association began to build the town of Dunedin under a system which recognized the eight hours' day. This system, as the writer of the new *Australian Year-book* reminds us, began voluntarily in New Zealand long before the unions that demanded and acquired it in Australia had come into existence. The Labour Laws of New Zealand, as recorded in the *Official Year-book* for 1908, include some forty measures of more or less importance. Mr. E. Tregear, Secretary for Labour, says in his "Explanatory Notes"—

"By far the most interesting and original of these laws is the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, first passed in 1894. This, with three later amending Acts, was consolidated in 1900, but has been amended afresh in 1901, 1903 and 1904. . . . The necessity of continuous amendment has been thrust upon the Legislature through the principle of industrial arbitration of a judicial character, being entirely unique and without statutory precedent. The law on this subject has to be kept flexible in order to meet the continual necessities of change and growth."²

The general tendency of the New Zealand industrial laws is highly favourable to the workers. The Factories Act, which has been frequently amended since 1901, is probably one of the most complete and perfect laws to be found in the statute-book of any country.

By the Old Age Pensions Act (1898-1905) every person of sixty-five years and upwards, who is of good character and does not possess a yearly income of £60, is entitled to a pension provided he has resided for twenty-five years in New Zealand. The number of pensions on March 31, 1907, was 13,257, and the amount paid was £314,184.³

¹ *The Labour Movement in Australasia*, pp. 118, 119.

² *The New Zealand Official Year-book*, 1908, Pt. II, Section XII-XVI, p. 515.

³ *New Zealand Handbook*, 1908, p. 32.

INDEX

- ADDERLEY, Father**, 135; on Christian Socialism, 136, 137
Adler, Victor, 55
America, recent developments of Socialism in, 225-242
 Prof. Flint on American Socialist leaders, 227
 Why is there no Socialism in the United States?—Prof. Werner Sombart's book, 233-242
American workmen, the, 233-240
Army under Socialism, the, 158-161
Australia, Socialism in, 243-263
 Socialism without doctrines, 243
 The Australian Federation of Labour, 244
 The career of William Lane, 247-250
 Views of a German workman in Melbourne, 250-254
 Divisions of Australian Socialists, 254-260
 Recent industrial legislation, 260-263

BAKUNIN, on patriotism, 154
Ball, Sidney, on the rewards of labour, 94
Bax, E. Belfort, 114-118
Behel, August, 30; on the peasant proprietor, 65, 109
Bernstein, Eduard, as a critic of Marxian dogma, 21, 22; on the catastrophic theory, 24; on the increasing number of capitalists, 25-29; quotes a remark by Mrs. Wilfer in *Our Mutual Friend* on the compensation of property-owners, 38; on the debt of Socialism to Capitalism, 56, 57; quotes Mr. Haldane on the housing question, 101; on the human wilderness of London, 102; on Socialism and religion, 129; on the improvement in the worker's lot, 154; on the influence of social democracy in politics, 156; on the worker's fatherland, 161; his position in the Socialist world, 177
Blatchford, Robert, on the condition of the poor, 35, 36; on the compensation of property-owners, 48; on the common ownership of land, 65; describes ideal citizens of the Socialist State, 90; in favour of equality of rewards, 93, 94; on Socialism and the family, 103; on women's work under Socialism, 114
Böhm-Bawerk, Eugen von, 29
Bourgeois, Léon, on the war of classes, 192
Bourguin, Maurice, on the dream of happiness for all, 168; on the progressive advance of wages as an ideal, 178, 179
Brentano, Lujo, 135
Briand, Aristide, 5; defender of Jaurès, 124; on the general strike, 201, 202, 206-208
Burleigh, Lord Balfour of, 36

CAPITAL, theory of the concentration of, 24, 25
Catastrophic theory, the, 23, 24
Child, lot of the, under Socialism, 116, 117
Christian Socialism, 135-143; leaders at home and abroad, 135, the Church Socialist League, 135; moderate views of Christian Socialist leaders, 135, 136; Father Adderley on, 136, 137; Marc Sangnier and Socialism, 137-139, the Abbé Gayraud's views, 139; M. Vandervelde's views, 141, 142; Friedrich Naumann and Christian Socialism in Germany, 142, 143

- Christianity, Primitive, and Social effort, 33; Dr. Menger on, 33
- Churches and Socialism, the, 118-134
- Clark, Victor S., on social conditions in Australasia, 243, 244, 247
- Communist Manifesto, 24; jubilee of the, 29; Australian Socialists and the, 256, 257
- Compensation, Socialists and, 46-54; reluctant compensators, 47, 48; more generous Socialist views on, 49; views of G. Bernard Shaw, H. G. Wells, Sidney Webb, E. Bernstein, and K. Kautsky, 49-51; difficulties of, as foreseen by Socialists, 51; the question of an indemnity, 51; views of Jules Guesde, 51; Socialists not agreed as to details of compensation, 53; but their best minds are prepared for some form of it, 53
- Cox, Harold, on Socialism and private property, 39
- DAVID, Eduard, on the peasant proprietors, 69
- Debs, Eugene V., 227
- Deslinières, Lucien, on provisional laws for the Socialist commonwealth, 86, 87; on prison reform, 91; country homes for criminals, 91; on the Press under Socialism, 148; on the possibility of a capitalist Holy Alliance, 169; on Internationalism, 170; on the yellow peril, 170
- Diehl, Karl, 161; on the position of Eduard Bernstein, 177
- Divorce, Socialist teaching on, 115, 116
- Drink-trade, Socialists and the, 44
- Dutch Social Democratic Party, the, 216, 217; and the general strike, 216, 217
- EDUCATION, Socialists and, 88
- Eisner, Kurt, on the funeral of Liebknecht, 164
- Engels, Friedrich, 21, 25; on the small property-owner, 64, 65
- Erfurt, Congress of, 21, 26, 118
- Expropriation of property-owners, the, 37, 38-45; difficulties of expropriation as foreseen by Socialists, 44, 45; three methods of expropriation suggested, 45; unlikelihood of voluntary surrender, 45; expropriation by attrition, 52
- FAMILY, Socialism and the, 101-117; sensitiveness of Socialists on this subject, 101; the housing question, 101, 102; Socialist dissatisfaction with some aspects of family life, 105; the idea of reconstruction, 105; Kautsky on the destruction of the family by capitalists, 105; darker side of family life as seen by Socialists, 105; Capitalism as the worst enemy, 105; labour of women and children, 107; absence of all security, 107; over-crowding and its consequences, 108; John Spargo on, 232
- Ferri, Enrico, on marriage and the family, 111; on Socialism and religion, 125, 126; on Socialist toleration of religion, 131
- Flint, Robert, on the international aspects of Socialism, 163, 167; on Socialism in America, 227
- Free love, Socialist teaching on, 109-112; ideas of *Enfantin* and Fourier now repudiated by all, 111
- Freedom, Personal, under Socialism, 82-91; Kautsky on, 82-84; Renard on, 88
- GAYRAUD, the Abbe, 135, 136; on Christian Socialism, 139
- General Confederation of Labour, the, 218-220
- Glaser, J. Bruce, 80
- Gore, Bishop, 135
- Griffuelhes, Victor, 185, 219
- Guesde, Jules, on the servitude of the masses of toilers, 34 (*note*); on capital and the capitalist, 43; "the wage-earning system . . . must be destroyed," 47; on the difficulties in the way of compensation, 51; on the question of an indemnity, 51; and the peasant proprietors, 65
- Guyot, Yves, on child labour in factories, 105, 106
- HAGERTY, Thomas, 141
- Haldane, R. B., quoted by Bernstein, 101
- Halévy, Daniel, 176, 177, 190
- Harcourt, Sir William, 57
- Hardie, J. Keir, on Socialism and property, 31; on the economic object of Socialism, 40; on co-

- operative production, 40; on the worker's age-limit, 107; on Socialism and religion, 121; on Socialist points of agreement, 163, 164
- Headlam, Stewart D., on free love, 112
- Hillquit Morris, on Socialism in America, 225, 226
- Holland, H. Scott, 135
- Home, would Socialism destroy the, 101-117
- Housing question, Socialists and the, 101, 102
- Hunter, Robert, on Socialism in America, 228
- IGLESIAS, Pablo, on the general strike, 212, 213
- Indemnity, the question of an indemnity to property owners, 51; views of Jules Guesde on, 51
- Inheritance, Socialists and, 55-63; importance of, to the new Socialists, 55; views of British and foreign leaders, 57-59; Rignano's scheme, 60-63
- Internationalism, the true goal of Socialists, 163-170; newer Socialist leaders on, 164-167; Werner Sombart on, 165, 166; is it a condition of Socialist success? 167-170
- JAURÈS, Jean, on the State and the law of inheritance, 57 (*note*); on the small proprietor, 68; his action in religious matters, 123, 124; incurs displeasure of fellow-Socialists, 123, 124; "the Jaurès case," 124; on internationalism, 166; on Marx and the proletariat, 175; the motto of his career, 178; on the general strike, 208, 209
- Jowett, F. W., on salaries under Socialism, 95
- KAUTSKY, Karl, his reply to Bernstein, 22, 27; in defence of Marx, 25; on social reforms, 31, 32; on capitalistic civilization, 39; on co-operative possession, 40; on expropriation, 45; on the compensation of property owners, 50, 51; on the details of compensation, 52; on the Agrarian question, 65-67; on Socialism and personal freedom, 82-84; on equality of payments, 98; Socialism not communism, 98, 99; on the burdens of the Socialist state, 99; on Socialism and the family, 104; on the darker side of family life, 105; on the industrial labour of women, 107; on the social evil, 108; on the Roman Catholic Church, 130; on Socialism and religion, 127-129, 131, 132; on social reform *v.* true Socialism, 140; on the Press under Socialism, 144; on the concentration of labour, 151, 152; on militarism, 159; on the arming of the people, 159, on international Socialism, 165; on the general strike, 209, 210
- Ketteler, Bishop von, 139
- Kingsley, Charles, 135
- LABRIOLA, Antonio, on Socialism and religion, 27, 33; on the religion of the future, 126; Christianity or nothing, 126
- Labriola, Arturo, on the Socialist state, 74, 75, 183, 185; on the "apostacies and compromises of Socialism," 188; on the futility of Parliamentary action, 188; Robert Hunter on his eloquence, 189
- Lafargue, Paul, on the right to be lazy, 46; opposes the views of M. Thiers, 46; on the peasant proprietors, 65; on religion, 118; on the general strike, 205, 206
- Lagardelle, Hubert, on Syndicalism, 183; on the warfare of classes, 183-185; on the revolt of the proletariat, 185; on Parliamentary Socialism, 188; his articles in the *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft*, 217, 218, on the "yellow" trade-unions, 218
- Lane, William, 244, 247-250
- Lassalle, Ferdinand, 64; as Alvan in *The Tragic Comedians*, 175
- Lee, Algernon, on Socialism in America, 229, 230
- Leroy-Beaulieu, Paul, 46, 53, 60
- Liebknecht, Wilhelm, his plan for the Socialist State, 73; his salary as editor of *Vorwärts*, 96; on religion, 126; the scene at his funeral, 164; his memorial tribute to Marx, 172, 173; his years in London, 195;

- early relations with the Marx family, 195; a story of his experiences in London, 222, 223
- Lorenzo, Anselmo, on the general strike, 214, 215
- MACDONALD, J. Ramsay, on the servitude of the wage-earner, 34 (*note*); on production as a national function, 40; on Socialists and inheritance, 59; against equality of payments, 95; on Socialism and the family, 102, 103; on the economic freedom of women, 113; on Socialism and religion, 121; approves the continuance of churches under Socialism, 122
- Maistre, Joseph de, on the union between the Church and the wealthy, 122, 123
- Manifesto, the Communist, 24; jubilee of the, 29; proposals of the, 36, 43
- Marx, Frau (Jenny von Westphalen), 172
- Marx, Karl, 21; his sympathy with the poor, 24; his *Verelendungstheorie*, 24; his mistaken time-reckoning, 25; the "Los-von-Marx" movement, 27, 28; and the Communist Manifesto, 36, and the small property-owners, 64, 65; on the true interest of the workers, 154; his views of patriotism, 154; his grave in Highgate Cemetery, 171-173; his sufferings in exile, 173; his influence on modern politics, 174-177
- Maurice, F. D., 135
- Menger, Anton, on early Christianity and social effort, 33; on the serfdom of the non-propertied classes, 34; on the effects of the French Revolution, 34; on the transference of property from individuals to the community, 40; on the distinction between Socialists and Social Reformers, 40; quotes Machiavelli's words on idle citizens, 43; on the right of inheritance under the present social order, 58; on the democratic work-State, 76; on the monarchy, 77, 78; on female suffrage, 79; on a bicameral system, 80; on the Socialist army of officials, 80; on the danger of Socialist interference with personal liberty, 84, 85; on "The Idea of Equality," 96, 97; on the material motive to labour, 97; on a possible Quietism, 97; on self-interest as a motive under Socialism, 97, 98; no moral "new birth" in Socialism, 98; desires a Socialist hierarchy, 98; on the housing question, 102; on free love, 109, 111; approves of the maintenance of the present form of marriage, 112; on the obligation of women to work, 115; on Socialism and religion, 132, 133, on the Press under Socialism, 148, 149; on patriotism, 155, 156
- Meredith, George, his portrait of Lassalle, 175
- Merlino, Saverio, 29; on the inevitable progress of Socialism, 75, 76; on Parliamentary rule, 79; on the family, 104
- Mermeix, on Socialism and property, 39; on the burdens of the Socialist State, 99; on the Press under Socialism, 150-153; on the army under Socialism, 160; on the general strike, 199-203; on the General Confederation of Labour, 219
- Métin, Albert, on Australian social conditions, 243
- Michels, Robert, 119, 185
- Monod, Wilfrid, 141, 142
- Morris, William, quoted by Mermeix, 89, 90; on the liberty to wear fine clothes, 90-93, 109, 110
- NAUMANN, Friedrich, 142, 143
- New Zealand, industrial legislation in, 264
- Patriotism, Socialist views on, 154-158; has the working-man a fatherland? 154; views of Bakunin, 154; and Menger, 155, 156; the anti-patriotic teaching of Hervé repudiated by many Socialists, 156, 157; views of Bernstein, 156; and of Renard, 157, 158
- Peasant proprietors, Socialists and the, 43, 64-70
- Pouget, Émile, on the general strike, 200, 201
- Press, under Socialism, the, 144-153; Fabian views on the Socialist

- press, 145 ; views of H. G. Wells, G. Renard, and other leaders, 146-149 ; L. Deslinières on a free Socialist Press, 148 ; A. Menger on the Press as guardian of morals, 148, 149 ; could Socialism tolerate a free Press? 150 ; the free field, 150 ; the limits of freedom, 151, 152 ; Mermeix on the slavery of the Press under Socialism, 150, 151
- Property, Socialist views on, 38-45 ; Radical views on, 39 ; property which is not demanded for social use, 41 ; property which the Socialist state would claim, 43 ; suggested methods of expropriation, 45 ; Socialists do not expect a voluntary surrender, 45 ; tenacity of property-holders, 45 ; the question of compensation, 46-54 ; reluctant compensators, 47-48 ; more generous views, 49-51 ; under the Socialist State, 52 ; Kautsky's plan for expropriation by attrition, 52 ; Socialists and small property-owners, 64 ; views of Marx and Engels on small property-owners, 64
- RAE, Dr. John, 30 ; on peasant proprietors, 67 ; on Socialism in America, 241, 242
- Reeves, William Pember, on social conditions in Australia, 243, 245-247
- Religion, Socialism and, 26, 27, 118-134
- Renard, Georges, on the property which the State should not claim, 42 ; Socialist views on private property, 42 ; on the Socialist State as a bureaucracy, 44 ; on the delegation of work by the State, 44 ; on Socialism and the drink trade, 44 ; on reforming the law of inheritance, 59 ; on the peasant proprietor, 67 ; on the smaller French capitalists, 71 ; on the office of French President, 78 ; on universal suffrage, 79 ; on female suffrage, 79 ; on the Referendum, 80 ; on Socialism and personal freedom, 86 ; on the division of work under Socialism, 88, 89 ; on the reward of labour under Socialism, 99, 100 ; special indulgence for scholars, artists and inventors, 99 ; approves of graduated rewards, 100 ; his letter to women, 114 ; on facilities for divorce under Socialism, 115, 116 ; on Socialism and religion, 124, 125 ; advice to a young man, 124, 125 ; on the moral standard of Socialism, 125 ; on the Press under Socialism, 147, 148 ; on patriotism, 157 ; his letter to soldiers, 157, 158 ; on the army under Socialism, 158, 159 ; on Internationalism, 167 ; his novel, *The Conversion of André Savenay*, 179
- Rewards of labour under Socialism, the, 88, 92-100
- Rignano, Eugenio ; on buying out the land-owners, 53 ; his scheme of inheritance, 60-63
- SANGNIER, Marc, 135 ; on Christian Socialism, 137-139
- Seilhac, Léon de, on Kautsky, 209
- Shaw, G. Bernard, on the compensation of property-owners, 49
- Shopkeeper, the small Socialists and, 70, 71
- Socialism, obsolete teachings of, 21-28 ; is there a scientific Socialism? 26 ; the earlier Socialists and religion, 27 ; Socialists and social reform, 32 ; Socialists and parliamentary action, 32 ; the general programme of, 29-37 ; the expropriation of property-owners, 38-45 ; property that Socialists do not claim for the State, 41 ; property that the State must claim, 43 ; Socialism and the ground-landlords, 43 ; and the means of transport, 44 ; and the drink trade, 44 ; suggested plans for expropriation, 45 ; the unlikelihood of voluntary surrender, 45 ; the alternatives of confiscation and compensation, 45 ; the question of compensation, 46-54 ; reluctant Socialist compensators, 47, 48 ; more generous views, 49-51 ; difficulties of compensation as foreseen by Socialists, 51 ; the question of an indemnity, 51 ; the absence of any agreement as to details of compensation, 53 ; the

question of inheritance, 55-63 ; Socialist views on inheritance, 57 ; Rignano's scheme, 60-63 ; Socialists and small property-owners, 64-72 ; working of the Socialist State, 73-81 ; views of Italian leaders on the Socialist State, 74-76 ; first principles of constructive Socialism, 76 ; noble aspects of, 77 ; framework of the Socialist State, 77 ; Socialists and the monarchy, 77 ; and universal suffrage, 78 ; and parliamentary rule, 79 ; and decentralization, 80 ; commandeering of lives under Socialism, 82-91 ; would individual freedom be possible ? 87 ; equality of opportunity, 87 ; and of obligation, 87 ; Socialists and education, 88 ; an expected heavy budget, 88 ; Socialism and the rewards of labour, 92-100 ; Socialism and the family, 101-117 ; the housing question, 101, 102 ; dissatisfaction of Socialists with many aspects of family life, 105-109 ; idea of a reconstruction of the family, 105 ; changes which Socialists seek to introduce, 109-117 ; economic independence of women, 112-114 ; facilitation of divorce, 115-117 ; the "mothers' bank," 113 ; lot of the child, 116, 117 ; Socialism and religion, 118-134 ; and Disestablishment, 130 ; and the Roman Catholic Church, 130 ; and the Protestant State Churches, 131 ; Christian Socialism, 135-143 ; its leaders at home and abroad, 135 ; views of Vandervelde, Kautsky, and others, 130-140 ; position of Marc Sangnier and the Abbé Gayraud, 137-139 ; position of Friedrich Naumann, 140, 141 ; the Press under Socialism, 144-153 ; could Socialism tolerate a free Press ? 150-153 ; Socialist views on patriotism, 154-158 ; on the army, 158-161 ; on foreign policy, 161, 162 ; on Internationalism, 163-170 ; relations with revolutionary Syndicalism, 183-224 ; in America, 225-242 ; in Australia, 243-263

Marxian doctrines, 21 ; on the increasing number of capitalists, 25 ; on a scientific Socialism, 26 ; on Socialism and religion, 27 ; on patriotism, 154 ; on Socialists and Internationalism, 165, 166 ; on the new evolutionary Socialists, 177 ; on revolutionary Syndicalism, 195 ; his book, *Why is there no Socialism in the United States ?* 233-241

Sorel, Georges, 29, 30, his teaching, 190-198 ; "the Marx of Syndicalism," 190 ; his pessimism, 190, 191 ; on Anarchism, 191 ; on the class warfare, 192 ; on Parliamentary Socialism, 192, 193 ; on Jean Jaures, 193, 194 ; on the present possessors of capital, 194 ; his anti-militarism, 195 ; on the destruction of the State, 195, 196 ; on the coming revolution, 197 ; on the general strike, 197, 198 ; his scorn for official Socialism, 198 ; on the English working-classes, 198 ; on Mr. Sidney Webb, 198 ; the mystical side of his teaching, 220, 221

Spargo, John, on Socialism in America, 230-233

State, the proposed Socialist (called sometimes "the Democratic Work-State"), 37, 44, 48, 52 ; burdens of the, 52 ; Kautsky's views on its burdens, 53 ; the Socialist State as an heir, 55 ; Prof. Tarbounch on, 55, 56 ; practical working of the, 73-81 ; views of Italian leaders on, 74-76 ; general framework of the, 77-81 ; monarchy, 77, 78 ; universal suffrage, 79 ; parliamentary rule, 79 ; official classes, 80 ; question of individual freedom in the, 82-91 ; conditions of life under the, 87 ; reward of labour under, 92-100 ; the Press under, 144-153 ; patriotism, armaments, and foreign policy under, 154-162 ; and Internationalism, 163-170

St. Ledger, A., on Socialism in Australia, 245, 246 ; on the career of William Lane, 247-250 ; on Australian Socialists and the family, 251, 252 ; on the Australian strikes of 1890 and 1891, 245, 246

Sombart, Werner, on the decay of

- Stelzle, Charles, 227
- Strike, the general, 199-217
- Suthers, R. B., on the compensation of property-owners, 48; on the small capitalist, 70, 71; on plans for the Socialist State, 56
- Syndicalism, Revolutionary, 183-224; its relation to Marxian teaching, 183; its nobler aspects, 184; attitude of its leaders towards Parliamentary Socialism, 184-188; a neo-Marxian revival, 186; contempt of the leaders for "intellectuals," 186; relations to Anarchism, 188-190; the teaching of Georges Sorel, 190-198; trades-unions and the general strike, 199-205; countries where Syndicalism flourishes, 204; and the General Confederation of Labour, 218-220; its mystical aspects, 220, 221
- TARBOURIECH, Ernest, on the Socialist State, 55, 56
- Téry, Gustave, on Jean Jaurès, 123, 124
- Transport, means of, Socialist views on, 44
- Tugan-Baranowsky, Michael, on International Socialism, 164; on the influence of Marx, 174
- Turati, Filippo, on the Socialist State, 56; on Syndicalism, 189; on the general strike, 215, 216
- VANDERVELDE, Émile, 29; on Socialism and religion, 118-120; on Parliamentary Socialists in their attitude to religion, 119; on the Churches as enemies of Socialism, 120; on a French Socialist banquet of 1848, 122; on Disestablishment, 130; on the Protestant Churches, 131, 142; on the future of religion, 132; on Socialism and the Roman Catholic Church, 141; on the Press under Socialism, 144; on the general strike, 210-212; on the doctrines of Syndicalism, 220, 221
- WALDECK-ROUSSEAU law of 1884, 199
- Wallas, Graham, on the limits of co-operation, 41
- Webb, Sidney, on the compensation of property-owners, 50
- Weitling, Wilhelm, 225
- Wells, H. G., on the collective ownership of property, 40, 41; on private rights in property, 42; on Socialists and "consumable property," 42; on Socialism and the drink trade, 44; on the compensation of property-owners, 49; on the right of inheritance, 59; on the danger of Socialist interference with personal liberty, 85; on the rewards of labour, 95; against equality of payment, 95; on Socialism and the family, 103, 104; on wives as wage-earners under Socialism, 114; on Socialism and religion, 122; on Disestablishment, 130; on the Press under Socialism, 146, 147; on advertisements in the Socialist Press, 151
- Wenck, Martin, 143
- Westcott, Bishop, 135
- Wilfer, Mrs., in *Our Mutual Friend*, quoted by Bernstein, 38, 39
- Work, Socialists and the right to, 76; the question of freedom to work, 84; unattractive employments, 89; Renard's proposed automatic balance system, 89; Socialists on the work-task and the leisure-task, 90; Socialists and the work of women, 107-109; economic independence of women, 113